

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW.

VOL. III.

OCTOBER, 1902.

NO. 4.

How Much Have the Trusts Accomplished?

TIN an article on the "‘Trusts’ in the Light of Census Returns"*, Mr. Wm. R. Merriam, Director of the Census, says: "Contrary to the general impression these great combinations do not control a very large part of the industrial output of the country." The general statement is more specifically defined: "The output of these combinations, although it seems enormous, does not represent much more than one-tenth of the total industrial product of the United States."

This tendency to minimize the "danger" of the trusts is quite characteristic of the bourgeois statesman, who is always looking out for popular sympathy and appreciation, and will necessarily represent the trusts as a "danger" and menace, ogle and octopus and what not. Mr. Merriam does it very eloquently in the article quoted. Many leaders of the bourgeois thought undoubtedly feel the constructive power of trusts, but only the boldest ones dare acknowledge it openly, for to them this constructive power means something entirely different from the socialistic conception—means only higher profits, higher personal gain, which it is wise policy to hide.

Be it as it may, we are here to criticize Mr. Merriam's statements, and not his socio-economic philosophy. *A priori* it would seem that that Mr. Merriam's data are above all suspicions, for he is at the head of the greatest statistical organization in the country, and this organization has made a special study of the American trusts, which study had been the basis of Mr. Merriam's article.

Yet we beg to differ with his conclusions. And in doing so, we will have to rely mainly upon the very same data, for unfortunately we have no private information as to the activity of the two hundred and odd trusts or "industrial combinations" now ex-

**The Atlantic Monthly*, March, 1902, p. 337.

isting in the country. Yet our conclusions—we will say it in advance—will be entirely different.

First, a little arithmetic. The combined value of the products of the 183 industrial combinations reported is \$1,661,295,364. The combined "value of products of American industry, including custom work and repairing,"* is \$13,091,876,790, which gives to the industrial combination, 12.6 per cent, or more than one-eighth of total production; and when the problem we are dealing with is of such enormous magnitude, the reader will agree that the difference between an eighth and a tenth is not an unimportant one.

But a difference of 2.6 per cent (even amounting as it does to the petty sum of \$340,388,796), would hardly be sufficient to publicly contradict an authority like Wm. R. Merriam. Let us look at the problem a little more closely.

The total production of the manufacturing industry of the United States is divided into the following five classes:

Classes—	Number of establishments.	Value of products includ- ing custom work and repairing.
1. Hand trades	215,990	\$ 1,186,201,455
2. Government establishments	145	21,452,079
3. Educational, eleemosynary and penal institutions	402	10,573,785
4. Establishments with a product of less than \$500 a year	127,419	29,724,643
5. All other establishments	296,651	11,843,924,828
	640,607	\$13,091,876,790

It will be evident at a glance that the second and third class government establishments, penal and educational institutions, etc., are beyond the power of trusts, beyond the influence of industrial concentration. The first class demands a great deal more attention.

Are we to speak of these 215,990 establishments as industrial establishments? Their activity as manufacture? Is any tangible consolidation of these establishments ever possible? To all these questions we have only one answer to give—a most emphatic "No!" Look at the composition of this class: 6,331 establishments are busy at bicycle and tricycle repairing, 51,791 at blacksmithing, 23,574 at boots and shoes custom work and repairing, 15,300 at house and sign painting, 12,243 at watch repairing, etc., etc.

*Twelfth census of the U. S. Census Bulletin, No. 122, Washington, D. C., December 30, 1901. Manufactures, Industrial Combinations.

*Twelfth census of the U. S. Census Bulletin, No. 150, Washington, D. C., March 14, 1902. Manufactures; United States.

Even a bourgeois statistician acknowledges the point we are making. Says Mr. S. N. D. North, chief statistician for manufactures, who prepared the Census Bulletin on Industrial Combinations* : "If from this total we subtract the value of the products of the hand trades, or the mechanical and neighborhood industries, which are not susceptible to the form of management known as the industrial combination, we have a residuum," etc.* And so we must eliminate the value of hand trades products.

We might also go into a heated argument about the fourth class establishments, which hardly deserve that name, for they have a yearly product of less than \$500 each, and an average production of \$233 each. Establishments of such dimensions were thought so unimportant that no previous census had ever undertaken to report them. However, we shall not try to appear too parsimonious, and will let them have the \$29,724,643. How do the trusts stand now?

Their production is equal to \$1,661,295,364 out of \$11,873,649,471, which makes 14.83 per cent, or a little over one-seventh.

We shall not stop here, though, for we hope to be able to do a great deal more. Throughout his article Mr. Merriam never even mentions the fact that his data are very much antiquated, for they refer to the state of affairs as it existed on May 31, 1900. Since then more than two years have elapsed, and in the history of the trustification of American industries these two years have been most eventful ones. How young this movement towards concentration every American ought to know, and especially Mr. Merriam, for his own source of information—the much-quoted bulletin bears witness thereof. Of the 183 trusts enumerated in Table 3 (pp. 12-17), 20 were organized in 1898, 79 in 1899 and 9 in the first five months of 1900; 108 trusts, or almost 60 per cent, were organized during the twenty-nine months preceding the collection of data.

Has the formation of gigantic industrial corporations and consolidations stopped on May 31, 1900? If anything, it went on at an accelerated rate. The fact must be taken into serious consideration if we wish to get a truthful answer to the question: How much have the trusts accomplished? We have no absolutely correct statistical data for any later period than the end of May, 1900, it's true. But an approximate calculation may readily be made. At any rate, Mr. Merriam should have acknowledged the limitation of his figures, and should have used the past tense and not

*I. C., p. 7.

*At the time Mr. North prepared this Bulletin the data for the combined industries and the complete value of products were not ready. Mr. North, therefore, started to calculate the relation of the value of trust products in 1900 to total value of products in 1890, and in doing so, thought it necessary to eliminate the hand trade production, in order to obtain the proper percentage.

the present, when making those positive assertions we quoted above.

The most authoritative financial organ of America, *The Journal of Commerce and Commercial Bulletin*, at the end of every year publishes a complete list of all the industrial combinations for that year, with data as to capitalization, etc. The definition of an industrial combination of this newspaper is almost identical with the official one.

In the issue of this newspaper for March 5, 1900, the capitalization of all the existing industrial combinations at the end of 1899 is estimated at \$3,803,872,000. As the capitalization of the 183 trusts is given by the census statistician on May 31, 1900, as \$3,607,539,200, the approximate correctness of the *Journal of Commerce*'s estimate (which was made three months in advance of the collection and two years in advance of the publication of the official figures) is no less than surprising.

In the issue of this paper for December 30, 1901, the following estimates are printed:

Total capitalization of trusts organized in 1899	\$2,663,445,000
Total capitalization of trusts organized in 1900	945,195,000
Total capitalization of trusts organized in 1901	2,805,475,000

Total capitalization of trusts organized within the three years 1899-1901	\$6,414,115,000
--	-----------------

Allowing, however, for possible duplicates, as many industrial combinations went through several reorganizations within these three years (the organization of the United States Steel Corporation from several component trusts being a notable example), the conservative *Journal of Commerce* takes \$5,000,000,000 as a figure that is nearer to the actual results of three years' consolidation. This estimate is rather below than above the truth. The total capitalization of all the industrial consolidations at the end of 1901 the *Journal of Commerce* estimates at \$6,500,000,000.

It is only a newspaper estimate,* you may say with contempt. We saw, however, how closely these estimates approached the results of careful statistical enumeration. This last estimate of six and one-half billions was made on the very same day that the Census Bureau in Washington announced its figures about the industrial consolidations, and could not therefore have been influenced by them. We can easily check the approximate accuracy of this guess.

On May 31, 1900, the combined capitalization of the 183 trusts

*As a matter of fact, the *Journal of Commerce* does not estimate at all in the popular conception of the word. It prints complete lists of organized combinations with their capitalization. The estimating consists only in reducing the sum by allowing for duplications.

was, according to the Census, \$3,607,539,000. The trusts organized in 1900 had a capitalization of \$945,195,000, and we can safely allow one-half of this sum for the trusts organized during June-December, 1900 (seven months). Capitalization of trusts organized during 1901 was \$2,805,475,000. We therefore get:

At the end of May, 1900.....	\$3,607,539,000
June-December, 1900	472,597,000
1901	2,805,475,000
	\$6,885,611,000

which is within 5 per cent of the newspaper's estimate. We think it close enough to satisfy the most fastidious statistician.

Enough has been said, we think, to justify the assertion that the capitalization of American trusts at the end of 1901 was six and one-half billion dollars; at least that much, if not considerably higher.*

What is the significance of this statement for the problem we are trying to solve? Only this: If a capitalization of 3,607 millions corresponds to a production of \$1,661,295,367, a simple 'rule of three' operation will show that a capitalization of 6,500 millions will correspond to a production of \$2,993,739,913, which constitutes 25.2 per cent, or more than one-fourth of the total value of products of American industry.

The objection might certainly be raised that the total value of products in 1902 is larger than in 1900. Theoretically the objection is valid. Practically, however, such increase is not very probable, if we may judge from the fact that exports of products of American manufactures have decreased from 433 millions in 1899-1900 to 403 millions in 1901-1902. Yet we do not want to seem biased in favor of our view. As the value of products has increased within the decade 1890-1900 from \$8,156,272,123 to \$11,873,649,471, or 45 per cent, we will allow a further increase of 9 per cent for the last two years, which will give for the total value of products \$12,942,277,923, and as the share of the trusts 23.2 per cent—still near enough to call it a fourth.

The conclusion at which we arrive at the end of this tedious study is this: At the time when the statistics of the Twelfth Census was collected (May 31, 1900) fully one-seventh (and not, as Mr. Merriam states, one-tenth) of the American industry was consolidated. At the time, however, when Mr. Merriam wrote his article one-fourth of all American manufactured products were trust-made products!

*The Democratic Campaign Text Book contains the list of industrial combinations and securities holding companies compiled by Mr. John Moody, of New York. This list contains the names of 287 corporations, with a capitalization of \$6,972,448,857.

We will not yield an inch of this ground. For, following the methods of the Census, we were much too conservative in our calculations. The official definition of an "industrial combination," though accurate enough for scientific purposes, was very exclusive for that very reason, and did not admit many important enterprises, which are nevertheless results of the consolidation tendency. The definition was as follows:

"For the purpose of the census, the rule has been adopted to consider no aggregation of mills an industrial combination unless it consists of a number of formerly independent mills which have been brought together into one company under a charter obtained for that purpose. We therefore exclude from this category many large establishments, comprising a number of mills which have grown up, not by combination with other mills but by the erection of new plants or the purchase of old ones.*

That under this rule gigantic establishments were excluded is evident. It will be sufficient to point to the old Carnegie Co.,* which was not included in the list of industrial combinations, though the capital of this company (to judge from what Carnegie himself received for his share in it), was almost \$600,000,000. Another important class of combinations which were left out by this definition were all the so-called "pools," the old-fashioned "trusts," etc., which have not been "brought together into one company under a charter obtained for that purpose," but have been brought together anyway. Under this rule the whole slaughtering and packing industry was not represented at all on the list of the industrial combinations, and yet for concentration and destruction of competition this industry has no equal.

Nor is this all. "There have been excluded from the statistics of the industrial combinations all corporations engaged in the manufacture and distribution of gas and electric light and power." This rule has been adhered to for the sake of avoiding some statistical difficulties, but economically there is no justification for it. Mr. North acknowledges that "a great many combinations on this branch of industry exist throughout the country." As a matter of fact, the gas industry is as completely consolidated as it possibly can be, and competition is eliminated. Yet the industry has a capital of 567 millions, and the value of its products is \$75,716,693. Both are included in the statistics of manufactures, but excluded from the statistics of "industrial combinations."

When all these limitations and exceptions are taken into consideration, will anybody deny that one-fourth is an extremely conservative estimate of the share the "trusts" have in the produc-

*Census Bulletin 122, p. 1.

*The data were collected long before the formation of the U. S. Steel Corporation.

*I. C., p. 2.

tion of American manufactures? Were we a little bolder, we would claim a third, and would then be not very far from truth.

Only consider what this conclusion means to the Socialist interpretation of economic evolution! In less than five years (1897-1901) one-fourth of all the manufacturing industry of the United States has been centralized in the hands of between two and three hundred corporations. And still the same process continues. How much longer will it take for the remaining 75 per cent to follow this example?

All this refers to manufactures only. Did space allow, we could draw a very similar picture in regard to transportation and mining, and perhaps in the near future we will do so. How much competition is there left in the anthracite coal industry? In silver, or copper, or iron ore mining? Or in the American railroads and street railways?* When we come to agriculture, however, that is an entirely different story, which we hope to live to tell.

In conclusion, a few words *pro domo sua*. Time was when, in asserting his view of economic evolution, the Socialist had only one enemy to fight; the bourgeois' defense of the competitive organization of society, which to him looked normal and eternal. In our own midst, however, a new prophet has arisen, who, in his effort to overthrow the teachers, denies everything, including the process of industrial concentration. A greater part of Bernstein's book, with all its formidable array of statistical data, is given up to this purpose.

Personally, we have a very strong opinion of the value of those statistical data. The only thing they prove to us is the author's striking ignorance of the first principles of statistical science, and this we could prove easily enough had not Kautsky, Bebel and others done it sufficiently well.

For one thing, however, we must give due credit to Bernstein. Having arrived at what to him seemed a new view of economic development, Bernstein made a perfectly proper effort to prove it scientifically, i. e., by study of actual conditions, and their developmental tendencies. Argue as much as we may about economic materialism, dialectics, fatalism, causation and what not, it is with the second, larger, part of Bernstein's book that his theories stand

*Says Thos. W. Phillips, member of the U. S. Industrial Commission: "American railroads, whose monopoly character is daily becoming more apparent, are stocked and bonded for about \$11,500,000,000 and had net earnings from operation after paying taxes, 1900-1901, of \$507,966,710. This means that these securities are to-day worth in the market over \$10,000,000,000. If we add to this the \$4,000,000,000 of water, gas, electric light, street railway and telephone securities, probably worth that much in the market, and the \$3,000,000,000 of securities of our largest so-called trusts, to say nothing of the telegraph, there looms up a valuation of industries more or less monopolistic in character of \$17,000,000,000, or probably one-fifth of what the present census will find to be the estimated true value of all property in this country."

Final report of the Industrial Commission, Vol. XIX., of the Commission's Reports, Washington, 1902, Industrial Combinations, Statement of Thos. W. Phillips, p. 685.

or fall—in the light of scientific statistics easily fall. Bernstein does not try to be dogmatic. Here, in New York, we have now our home product in the line of "criticism," however. But, as a follower of the Bernstein school above all denies the universal law of equal capitalist development for all countries, does the American "Bernstein school" try to prove Bernstein's theories by a careful study of American conditions? Not at all. Tiresome repetition of Bernstein's arguments and assertions, hair-splitting criticism in the domain of value, economic materialism and ethics proves to be easier and pleasanter than a careful study of statistical tables. Or is it because the "critics" are afraid of the results of such careful study?

For the formidable process of industrial consolidation and concentration in the United States is easily studied and easily proved. Though a Socialist, Bernstein may deny it, one need not be a Marxist to acknowledge it. If I may be permitted to quote from a personal letter, here is what Mr. S. N. D. North, Chief Statistician for Manufactures of the Twelfth Census, says on this question: "You are quite right in the supposition that in almost all of the great lines of industry the tendency is to a decrease in the number of separate establishments accompanying a large increase in the amount of capital invested, number of employes and value of products."

Yet those are all assertions, the truth of which a Bernstein will contest.

DR. I. M. RUBINOW.

Socialism and the American Farmer.

LHE agrarian question has always been one upon which there has been great difference of opinion among Socialists. Various theories of the economic development of the farming industry have led to diverse positions in practical tactics. Some Socialists have maintained that the farmer was being steadily transformed into a tenant or mortgaged dependent and that his exploitation must come through the landlord and the money lender. But usury and tenantry are remnants of a pre-capitalistic stage of industry, and if such a movement existed it would tend to support the contention of bourgeois economists who hold that since agriculture is evolving in an opposite direction from factory industry it must constitute an insuperable obstacle to the success of Socialism. That landlordism and mortgage indebtedness does exist to so large an extent in farming is rather a proof of the backwardness of the industry than of its evolution toward a co-operative stage.

Another theory of development, which still finds credence in many localities (see, for example, the present platform of the Socialist party in Nebraska), holds that the great farm is devouring the smaller and that the farmer is destined to become a wage-worker on a great bonanza farm.

One of the fundamental principles of Socialist economics is that exploitation of the producer is inherent in the nature of the productive process. Unless this can be shown to hold true for agriculture we must admit that there is a different law of exploitation, and hence, in all probability, a different law of development and a different ultimate goal for that industry.

Before committing ourselves to any conclusion, let us examine the facts as set forth in the last census of the United States. Taking first the question of concentration, we find that while the average farm has grown somewhat in size during the last decade, being now 146.6 acres, against 136.5 in 1890, it is still somewhat smaller than in 1870, or in any year previous to that time, and is not yet as large as the 160 acres which makes up the "homestead" of the Western States. This increase in size is easily accounted for by the increase in the number of such homesteads, together with the few great ranches and Indian reservations operated by the government, but which are wholly abnormal developments, having no relation to the evolution under discussion. In the older States, where capitalism has been longest established, there is no tendency whatever toward concentration in farm ownership, as indicated by the growth of large farms.

Notwithstanding these facts, I am not wholly ready to admit that this line of evolution is forever closed. Some recent mechanical developments in the farming industry may possibly have some important effects on this point. Up to the present time no great success has attended the efforts to apply other than horse power to the fundamental agricultural operations. This has been especially true of plowing. Almost all attempts in this direction have depended upon the use of either two fixed engines with a cable, to which the plows were attached, which was too cumbersome to offer any great advantage over horse power, or else upon a traction engine dragging ordinary plows behind. In the latter case the engine buried itself as soon as it struck loose ground and became useless. A new invention substitutes revolving steel discs for the plowshare and attaches the power directly to the disc. It would seem that this device overcomes the objections to the previous instruments. A second great invention from which much is expected is the combined harvester and thresher, which is now in use in many localities where climatic conditions permit the grain to ripen on the growing stalk. Another great obstacle to the utilization of mechanical power in farming has been the lack of a cheap, light and strong motor. The host of inventors now working on automobile motors seem about to solve this problem. Should these mechanical advances prove successful, a considerable extension of farming on a large scale would seem probable.

Another obstacle to the growth of the farm unit which bids fair to be removed in the near future is the lack of pressure, so to speak, upon capital. While room remains for its investment in other enterprises, capital shows little inclination to enter the field of agriculture. But the vast increments of surplus value now accruing to the capitalists of the United States is bound before long to reduce the rate of interest in industry and force capital to flow into all productive fields. It therefore follows that we will soon see much greater efforts than have been made hitherto to capitalize farming. This tendency will be accelerated by the further fact that the tendency, to which I have called attention elsewhere, of various steps in agricultural production to be taken from the farm, seems to have about reached its limit, as no processes remain which do not demand close physical connection with the soil. Hence all this pressure which has hitherto been diverted from the actual cultivation of the soil will now be applied directly to the primary processes of production. Notwithstanding all these facts, I am inclined to think that the process of concentration through the absorption of small by larger farms is too distant to have any appreciable effect upon present con-

ditions or to demand attention in discussion of present Socialist tactics.

On the question of tenantry, a quotation from the Seattle *Socialist* will give a good idea of the position of many Socialists. The quotation is taken from an article very properly entitled "An Excited Editorial," for it certainly does look as if some one was excited when it was written. It is written in reply to what is alleged to be an "attack" by the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW. I can assure the *Socialist*, however, that there is a distinction between an attack and a difference of opinion, and that one of the last papers I would ever think of attacking would be the *Socialist*. Here is a quotation which the *Socialist* repeats from a previous number in order to emphasize and justify it:

"The truth is, the farmer is on his way to become a farm laborer. While he still imagines himself a proprietor, the majority of his class are either on mortgaged or rented farms, practically only laborers. These sell their labor power for a bare subsistence and are subject to immediate discharge like wage laborers. The tendency toward large farms is not marked. But the tendency toward capitalist ownership of all the small farms is very marked."

Here are five distinct assertions. Three can be shown to be wholly wrong; one is doubtful, and one, "the tendency toward large farms is not marked," we have already shown to be true. Let us test these statements in the light of the facts as brought out in the census of 1900. A superficial examination lends some support to the position of the *Socialist*. The per cent of farms operated by owners has decreased from 74.5 in 1880 to 64.7 in 1900. It is one of the commonest sayings concerning statistics that "nothing is more deceptive than percentages," and it is seldom we find a better illustration of the truth of this statement. When we examine the absolute number of farms we find that there are 1,730,065 more farms now than twenty years ago. In this same period the number of farms operated by owners has actually increased 729,065. During the same time about one million new farms have been brought into cultivation under the tenant system. With the number of farm owners increasing 24 per cent in twenty years, it should be evident that whatever else may be happening, there is no sign of farm owners being transformed into tenants on any extensive scale.

The *Socialist* was particularly severe in its condemnation of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW for saying that the farmers are in about equal danger from the coming of the next ice age and from conversion into a race of mortgage and tenant farmers. If tenantry alone is to be considered, I am free to admit that the statement needs revision, for if these statistics show anything it

is that taking the United States as a whole farmers will become a race of tenants at exactly the same time and place that two parallel lines meet.

But this is only a part of the story of tenantry. A study of the census statistics by geographical divisions shows that where agriculture has been longest established, there tenantry is least developed and is growing the least, if at all. In New England the percentage of farm owners to total farms varies from 79 per cent in Rhode Island (which has but 6,000 farms) to 95 per cent in Maine, where there are 59,000. No New England state shows any decrease in the total number of farm owners during the last ten years. New York is the only important Eastern state offering any exception to this rule. Here the number of farm owners is actually decreasing, they having fallen off 20,714 from 1880-90, and 7,955 from 1890-1900. Two important facts, however, prevent the drawing of any general conclusions as to increase of tenantry from these figures. First, the rate of increase appears to be declining rapidly, and, second, an examination of the total numbers of farms cultivated shows that these are growing fewer each decade, which would indicate that agriculture in New York was rather declining rapidly than evolving toward a higher and more capitalistic plane.

In the North Central division the percentage of tenants varies considerably. It is highest in Illinois and Iowa, where the percentage of farm owners sinks to 60 and 65 per cent respectively. Even in these states it must be noted that there is a small increase in actual number of farms operated by owners. A possible explanation of this situation may be found in the fact that favorable markets, and an extremely fertile soil, combined with a highly developed system of dairy farming, has made the farm income of these two states so large that there is still room for a class of small parasitic landlords to exist between the great capitalist exploiter and the actual tiller of the soil. This explanation finds support in the fact that the small towns of this region are made up almost entirely of "retired farmers," who are living upon the rent of the farms which they formerly operated. If this were really a growing movement it would be in decided opposition to Socialist philosophy, because it would indicate the rise of a new and permanent middle class.

Furthermore, the greatest percentage of tenantry in the United States is in precisely that region in which agriculture is most backward—the Black Belt. It would probably be generally agreed that the two states most backward in their agricultural conditions are Mississippi and South Carolina, with Alabama close behind. Now it so happens that it is in just these three states that tenantry reaches its highest point; the proportion of

farms operated by owners in these three states, in the order named above being as follows: 37.6, 39 and 42.3. Yet even in these states there is a continuous and quite rapid increase in the number of farm owners, indicating that tenant farms are made up of farms newly brought into cultivation, and that so far from owners becoming tenants, there is much more reason to believe that many tenants are becoming owners. All general conclusions as to this locality, however, must be modified by consideration of the peculiar history and present racial and social conditions, phases of the subject impossible to treat at this time.

The only region in which farming has reached a higher stage of development than in the Eastern market garden states is in the wheat belt of the far West. Taking North Dakota as an example of the conditions prevailing in this region, we find 91 per cent of the farms are operated by owners and that the absolute number of owners is increasing very rapidly.

Nebraska and Kansas offer the most striking exceptions to the general rule, being almost the only states of any importance to show an absolute decline in the number of farms operated by owners. Perhaps an explanation of this condition is found in the fact noted by Prof. Edwin Earle Sparks in the September *Chautauquan* that in these two states the "frontier" has, for the first time in the history of America, retreated. The whole western portion of these two states has been depopulated, owing to continued drought. Says the article referred to above: "Thousands of acres lie in these districts belonging to loan and trust companies, while many tracts have been abandoned and offered for sale for taxes....It is practically returned to 'wild' country, though not to the national domain....Lines of posts with occasional strands of wire, dry irrigation ditches, and abandoned dug-outs or sod houses show where overconfident man has retreated from the unequal contest." As I have shown in my treatment of this region in "The American Farmer," there have been other than physical causes at work in this advance and retreat of the frontier, but at any rate it will scarcely be claimed that this region represents a typical development toward the highest capitalist stage.

Washington shows an increase in the number of farm owners of nearly 12,000, or about 75 per cent, during the last ten years, while Oregon's farm owners have increased more than fourfold in the last twenty years, from which it would appear that the agricultural conditions in the locality of the Seattle *Socialist* had neglected to follow its economic philosophy in their evolution.

One thing which is incidentally apparent on this point is that as a general rule Socialism is growing in just those states where tenantry is least developed. This is what would naturally be ex-

pected by anyone who realized that tenantry is a sign of degeneration and not of advance.

The statistics of mortgaged farms have not yet been published. But I feel perfectly safe in predicting that when published they will show that the absolute number of farms free from incumbrance was greater in 1900 than in 1890. In this country mortgages have been quite largely incurred as security for the purchase price, and the tendency is for the borrower to become the owner. Thus it is seen that there is no sign whatever of the farmer being "on his way to become a farm laborer." It is at least doubtful if a "majority are either on mortgaged or rented farms," and there is no trace of the "tendency toward capitalist ownership of all the small farms." With these few exceptions, the basis of "The Excited Editorial" can be accepted. All this talk of landlords and money lenders belongs to Populism and not to Socialism, and should be left to the dying remnant of that party.

Such talk implies that if the farmer could once succeed in freeing himself from debt and the landlord he would be an "independent farmer," free from exploitation. If, on the other hand, it can be shown that ownership of a farm is no protection whatever from the real basic exploitation, then such ownership will cease to allure, and the farmer may be made to see his affinity with the wage-working proletarians of the shops and mines. If the farmer can escape from exploitation, while capitalism still remains, then he has no interest in its abolition. But if, on the other hand, it can be shown that his exploitation, like that of the wage-worker, is absolutely inherent in the capitalist system and cannot be abolished while that system remains, then he is ripe for the Socialist propaganda.

The question of the real nature of the process by which the farmer is exploited becomes then of greatest importance, for that he is exploited no one can deny who will study into his present conditions and past history. The wage-worker possesses but a single commodity—labor power—which is valueless unless instantly marketed. This commodity must be sold to a class who own the wage-workers' means of existence. The continuous presence of an army of unemployed renders this labor power subject to almost perfect competition, which reduces its price to the cost of production.

The position of the farmer is almost exactly analogous. With the removal of a large portion of the essentials of agriculture from the farm, he is reduced to the possession of labor power in only a trifle more developed and more permanent form than the unused strength and skill of the wage-worker. He, too, must sell this product to a class that have possession of the things essential to his existence. The thing which has been hitherto over-

looked in his case, however, is that in the disposal of this partially created product he, too, is subject to an unlimited competition analogous to the wage-workers' army of the unemployed. Perhaps the reason for this oversight lies in the fact that his army of the unemployed presents itself in a less dramatic form, consisting as it does in the almost endlessly expansible resources of nature.

The idea has in some way become current in the United States that the period of rapid extension of farm area in this country is past. It may surprise some people to learn that more than 218,000,000 acres were added to the farm area of the United States during the last ten years. This is almost twice as much as was ever added in any previous decade, even in the years when the great migrations were being made into the states of the Mississippi Valley and the Great Plains, and more than twice the total farm area of all the states bordering on the Atlantic Ocean. All this in the face of the fact of the "retreat of the frontier," to which reference has been previously made. It is estimated that there are over 160,000,000 acres in Canada which are suitable for farming purposes and which are being settled at a most remarkable rate. The irrigation movement, to which the general government has just lent its assistance, contains almost boundless possibilities of expansion. The value of the irrigated crop for 1899 was \$86,860,491, or almost as much as the combined crop of New Hampshire, Massachusetts and Connecticut, and it must be remembered that the growth in the three years since then have been by far the most rapid in the history of the irrigation movement. In other regions, new methods, coupled with partial irrigation, are adding immensely to the area of productive land, and to the productiveness of that already under cultivation.

New crops have the same effect. Macaroni wheat alone promises to almost double the wheat-producing capacity of the United States.

The utilization of what have hitherto been waste products operates in the same manner. If more can be raised on the same area, or greater value secured from existing crops, then the margin of cultivation is forced lower, competition grows fiercer, and the pressure forcing the farmer toward the subsistence point grows heavier. The marvelous discoveries recently made in the utilization of corn, both grain and fodder, illustrate this fact.

Socialists have long pointed out how every improvement in the tools of production helps to keep wage-workers closer to the subsistence point. That they are able to resist this tendency to some extent through organization does not argue against the existence of the tendency. But what has been hitherto overlooked is that the same law is operating upon the farmer. Every

year sees almost every machine used in agriculture made more productive. This simply means that the margin of cultivation can be forced a little further, and a little larger product be thrown upon the competitive market.

The importance of this point, if true, can scarcely be over-estimated, as it contains the key to the whole question of the exploitation of the farmer. If a society is to be perfectly competitive, there must necessarily be within that society no instrument of production which cannot be secured with equal ease by every individual. The moment a tool is introduced, requiring the co-operation of two or more men for its operation, while individual ownership still remains, free competition is destroyed, because one must then secure the machine and thereby have the others at his mercy. As soon as co-operative production became dominant, the owners of the necessarily monopolized tools were able to take from the non-owners, who were exposed to the full force of competition, all save subsistence. The process of evolution has now practically abolished free competition everywhere save among the actual producers of wealth, whether these be wage-workers or farmers. Under these conditions the interests of these producers who are thus exposed to free competition becomes identical in their opposition to the owners of the monopolized means of exploitation.

This is really no new theory, but is simply the extension into the field of agriculture of principles now generally recognized as operating in other fields of production.

Some important deductions as to tactics arise naturally from this line of reasoning. If the exploitation of the farmer comes fundamentally through landlordism and usury (neither of which are an essential of capitalistic production), then he was right when he sought relief in depreciation of currency and tinkering with banking and credit systems, because as a tenant or borrower he was fundamentally a member of a debtor rather than an exploited class.

If, on the other hand, the analysis here made is correct, then he is not primarily interested in any struggle between the debtor and creditor class, since his exploitation takes place, not in the field of exchange, but of production, and the abolition of usury and landlordism would not relieve him from exploitation. This position gains something of support from the fact that the capitalist class of this country (which may be generally depended upon to be fairly class-conscious) has used all the governmental powers which it possesses to maintain the existence of small farms operated by owners. The fact that it has been fairly successful in this line has just been shown by the figures quoted from the last

census. The homestead law and the provisions of the recent irrigation act are instances in point.

This analysis has an important bearing upon some other questions of tactics—particularly upon the desirability of the step-at-a-time movement through “state Socialism,” or rather “state capitalism.” To make myself clear upon this point I would ask the reader to consider for a moment the whole productive process of society as a single organic movement. Accept for a moment the hypothesis of organic sociology upon this one point, and consider society as a gigantic organism engaged in the production of goods for the satisfaction of its needs. Considered in this manner, it will at once be seen how completely this productive process is dominated by the operation of a few essential industrial processes which have now reached the stage of monopoly. Just how complete this domination is at present is shown by the very excellent article of Dr. Rubinow, which appears elsewhere in this number. The owners of these dominant industrial processes, themselves shielded from the forces of competition, absorb to themselves, not simply the surplus values of the workers directly employed in the monopolized processes, but of all those workers who are engaged in the unmonopolized fields, but who are unable to complete their production without the use of the monopolized processes.

The important deduction which follows from this position is that the removal of any one of these dominant monopolized industries from private ownership to governmental ownership and operation would simply add to the profits of the monopolized processes still in the field of private ownership. To illustrate: If railroads, telegraphs and telephones were nationalized and run at cost, the returns from the operation would, by force of government, be reduced to the same level with the industries still in the field of free competition. The productive field would then, as now, be divided into two portions, one of which would be under private monopoly, as at present, and the other would be again divided into two parts, according to the manner in which the monopoly element was taken out. In one of these parts it would be squeezed out by pressure of competition, in the manner already described, and in the other it would be removed by legal enactment. In either case the owners of private monopoly would, as at present, absorb all the surplus value produced. This theory finds its justification in the practical working out of state capitalism in every country where it has been tested. As an incidental force tending to hasten this result, it should be noted that every industry removed from the monopoly field into the governmental field would release a large amount of capital, and thus hasten the monopolization of the field hitherto competitive.

Hence as long as a single industry remained in the field of private monopoly all the efforts to abolish the monopoly element in other fields would but add to the power of this one monopolized industry to absorb the surplus value produced by the remainder of society. Since any industry could be transferred to the monopoly field and thereby acquire the power to absorb surplus value for its owners, which employs tools requiring the co-operation of several persons, it really means that so long as the producers of labor power (the laborers in any line of industry) were outside the process of nationalization they would be exploited as at present.

If, now, this argument is in any degree sound, it offers additional support to my position that farmers must find their political interests best expressed by the party which best expresses the interests of the wage-working proletarians. I would offer this as a partial answer to the position taken by Comrade Kautsky in the September REVIEW. In this connection it is hardly necessary to explain to our American readers the defect in that portion of his argument which implies an independent agrarian party making alliances with the Socialist party. The history of this country shows that at no time have there really been more than two great political parties really contending for the mastery. The principal reason for this is a peculiarity in the form of government of the United States, which I do not remember ever being pointed out before in just this connection. This is the only country in the world of any importance whose chief magistrate is subject to popular election. This makes that office the highest prize offered in any political struggle in the world. No political party in America can hope to maintain a continuous existence, unless it holds out to its members at least the possibility of some time securing this first prize. Consequently a permanent third party, taking part in alliances and dividing power with other parties is an impossibility. The growth of a "third party" must be sufficiently rapid to make it appear possible that the dominant position in politics will be attained by it in something like a near future. Recent developments in the legislative machinery of the national government make this point still stronger. Under the system of committee rule, and autocratic domination of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the majority party rules with practically despotic power. An opposing minority, even if a powerful one, has little power in legislation, and a third party has practically no influence whatever. Under these circumstances the possibility of a large number of political parties playing any part in our political life, as is the rule in Europe, is excluded.

Our presidential elections always turn, nominally at least, on some one issue. As soon as capitalism is no longer able to ignore

Socialism, there will be but two parties in the field—a Socialist and anti-Socialist. The farmer will then be forced to choose between them. That he will choose the Socialist Party, even if he considers it, as Comrade Kautsky says, "the lesser of two evils," there can be little doubt. But the Socialist Party cannot afford to have him simply in this negative position. It needs his positive help, both now and in the period of reconstruction. Hence the pressing need of propaganda and educational work among the farmers of America.

A. M. SIMONS.

Government by Injunction.

HE frequency with which the equitable remedy known as the writ of injunction has been invoked in conflicts between Labor and Capital during the last ten years, with the seeming, if not avowed, object of hampering and injuring the cause of Labor, demoralizing their otherwise solid ranks and defeating them in their impending struggle for better conditions of life and work, has created a strong and ever-growing feeling of dissatisfaction and revolt against what is generally known as government by injunction, and a deep-seated mistrust for the courts and judiciary of the country. If the departure of the courts from their traditional impartiality in administering justice, and the abuse of the discretion and power vested in them, is true, there is a problem that confronts the people, which needs a fearless and careful consideration.

What Is an Injunction?

The writers on the subject of injunctions, and courts generally, define a writ of injunction to be a judicial order directed to a person or persons, requiring them to do or refrain from doing a particular thing. It may be used for the enforcement or prevention of wrongs.

In England and in this country, where the law was unwritten, but was being built up from customs, traditions and decisions of judges for centuries past, forming what has been known as the common law, there was found to be need of a tribunal and system of jurisprudence, which would offer a remedy for wrongs for which the rules of common law were inadequate. The rules of law which took root in the feudal system of England could not always answer the growing needs of the rising city population, merchants, individual property-holders and producers. With the appearance of new economic and social conditions, the courts of equity were trying to bring the law in harmony with the demands of society, which, during the seventeenth, eighteenth and early portion of the nineteenth century was made up largely of comparatively small producers, artisans and farmers, who owned their small patches of ground, and a few tools and implements of labor, and also owned the product of their toil. Production on large scale, by huge and complicated machinery, is only of recent origin. The difficulties which would arise between such independent artisans and producers, who were small property holders, would be adjusted by courts of equity, where the law had no remedy to offer. So, when a man would unlawfully obstruct by a dam a stream of flowing water, equity, at the suit of the party injured.

would compel the wrongdoer, by injunction, mandatory in character, to remove, and prohibitory in character, to abstain from further interfering, with the flow of the stream. Or, if one unlawfully erected a wall shutting out the light from another, equity would compel him to tear it down and to refrain from further interference with the other's right. It left the judge the arbiter of what was right and what was wrong. There was no danger in this power of the courts at that time. As long as the bulk of the people were small property holders, farmers and artisans, the administration of equity from the point of view of the small property holder was also the law, the enforceable right of the predominant class being at all times the law of the land. In these bygone days of our daddies, the judges picked and selected from among them, imbued with all the ideas of right and wrong, which the great majority of the people then entertained, placed upon the bench to administer justice, would apply the principles of common law or equity, guided by their own experience, which was the experience of the majority of the people, and by the standard of moral conception of justice, right and wrong prevalent at the time among the bulk of the nation.

But as a nation we have since undergone a most stupendous change in our methods of production. Large, extensive and most complicated machinery has taken the place of the crude and simple tools of two generations back, and with this a new arrangement of social classes has been introduced. Since the Civil War the rise of the nonproducing capitalist class to the commanding position in the economic, political and social life of our nation, where everything is made subservient to its wishes, where the great mass of the producers are at the mercy of a few men, who hold the means required to carry on the production of the necessities of life without which the nation cannot exist, has brought forward a new nation within American society, nameless though it may be, yet a nation, distinct from those who assume to think, act and represent the American people, a nation which commences to think for itself, to withdraw itself into a separate organization, a nation with new ideas of right and wrong, new ideals of social justice, a nation composed of men and women whose hearts beat for each other, who cherish the same hopes and aspirations for the future of their children and their children's children, who are bound together by the ties of social kinship, mutual interest and devotion, who are the homeless, nameless, propertyless multitude, which uses its brains and muscle in battling with the blind forces of nature, to create all the good things, human brains, hands and skill can produce for a modern civilization—the great Nation of Labor, the Working Class of America.

No sane man can honestly contend, at this stage of develop-

ment of the big combinations of capital, monopolies and trusts, that these combinations or their members and stockholders perform any useful or necessary function in the production of wealth, in the creation of which they are supposed to be engaged. How much steel has there ever been made by Morgan or the stockholders of the United States Steel Trust? How much coal has there ever been mined by the coal barons, who appropriated to themselves the misleading title of mine-“operators?”

It is the steel worker, the miner, etc., who, for living or starvation wages, in the sweat of their brows extract and shift and mould the crude things of nature into objects of common usage. The capitalist gets the cream of their labor. He pays them in wages, irrespective of what they create for him, what he can buy their labor power for on the market. It is natural that the laborer should be interested in getting as high a price for his labor power as he possibly can, and the capitalist in securing it as cheaply as he can. Hence the conflict between labor and capital, which takes the form of strikes, boycotts and lockouts.

Injunctions in Strikes and Lockouts.

The miners who cannot live on 90 cents a day, like one solid body, rise and demand an increase of wages. Their right to life is not questioned by the courts. The right of the mine-owners to what the law recognizes as their private property, and their right to use it as they please, is also unquestioned by the courts. The miner, however, cannot live without working, though the mine-owner can. The right of the one hundred and fifty thousand coal miners to life comes at once in conflict with the so-called right of private property by the few mine-owners, and with their right to use their mines as they please, to close or operate them.

Shall Equity help the few coal barons, who are troubled neither by hunger nor cold, to drive into submission a million of men, women and children? Or, shall it listen to the demands of American manhood and womanhood for a right to a decent life? If the law is inadequate to help the striking miners, shall not Equity step in and administer justice according to the demands of the new society, the new nation, the working miners and all other producers of the land?

But, the conception of justice by the courts, who attempt to administer equity, is far from the one held by the working people. Who are our judges? Are they men who go to the bench from the workshop, mine, factory or field? Are they men whose sympathies, feelings, ideas, thoughts and hopes are those of the producers? The fact is too well known. They are men who are picked from the faithful hangers-on and servants of the capitalist and property-holding class, from the ranks of corporation lawyers; men who, as a rule, look upon the laborer as a worthless, shiftless

and dangerous member of "society." Their sympathies and interests are bound up with the capitalist class, and they become its willing tools in the troubrous times of strikes and boycotts. Since the memorable injunction issued by Judge Jenkins, of Milwaukee, some years ago, the injunction has been of more service to the capitalists in every strike of any kind or size, in defeating the striking working men, than the national guard or regular troops. In many instances the injunction has defeated strikers much more effectively than the police and regular troops could ever hope to accomplish. In their eagerness to serve their masters the courts have disregarded the constitutional rights of citizenship, brushed them aside, and thrown men into jail for disobeying an order prohibiting them from holding public meetings, or talking to their neighbors and discussing their grievances together, or assisting with food and money those who were in need of it. Many a union officer has been enjoined from distributing to the striking members the so-called relief funds they themselves have helped to create by years of contributions. The arrogance assumed by Judge Jackson in the West Virginia cases, in which Mother Jones, together with other organizers of the United Mine Workers' Union, were cited to appear for disobeying an order prohibiting them from holding meetings, can hardly be surpassed. The judge was careful to send the organizers to different county jails, and to suspend the sentence over that elderly woman who, by years of toil and devotion for the cause of the miners, has earned the name of "Mother." Judge Jackson only voiced the general sentiment of the judiciary of the country, when, in most severe and scathing terms, he arraigned labor organizations, their walking delegates and organizers.

Thus supreme reigns Capital. The troops, the militia and police, the courts and the whole machinery of government are at its disposal. Capital needed only to be crowned, receive the holy anointment, and continue to reign by the grace of God. This was attempted to be done by President Baer, of the Mine Owners' Association, when, in the capacity of a royal prelate, with bare head and arms upraised, he placed the crown upon the head of King Capital in these words: "The rights and interests of the laboring man will be protected and cared for, not by the labor agitators, but by the Christian men to whom God in his infinite wisdom has given the control of the property interests of the country."

The Remedy.

What shall be the remedy against so-called government by injunctions?

1. A system which permits one man, sitting as judge, to issue an order, try, judge and condemn another for the violation of his own order, is subversive of all principles of a free and democratic

form of government. Every person before being punished for the violation of any law or order of court, should have the right to a trial by a jury of his peers. Unless this principle is recognized in our jurisprudence, the courts will before long become a legal despotism, with which the so-called administrative orders of Russian czarism, sending men and women to Siberia without trial, could well compare. Contempt of court must be declared a crime, triable by a jury. The power of sending active strikers to jail and thus demoralizing the ranks of the striking workmen should be taken away from the judges. A bill for such a law was introduced in the Massachusetts Legislature at its last session by James Carey, the Socialist Representative in the House. The combined efforts of the Republicans and Democrats, however, defeated the bill. But the attempt will be renewed as long as there shall be a Socialist in the House, and pressed again and again, until it becomes a law.

2. But such a law could not do away with the discretion of judges in granting injunctions. The judge, whose training, association and sympathies are with the employing class, is not apt to use his discretion in favor of striking workmen. Organized labor must look for a permanent and lasting remedy through the independent use of the ballot. The Nation of Labor is, and must be, at war with the small Nation of Capital. This must not be overlooked nor forgotten. On Labor day and before elections this small nation of Capital manages to sugar-coat the working population and lull them into self-destruction with eloquent orations and editorial diatribes on the Dignity of Labor, and keep itself in the possession of all the branches of government, executive, judicial, and legislative, re-enforcing itself at each and every election by the votes of these very working men, who become its willing slaves after election. The working men must learn that they can receive no justice until they themselves control and master all the branches of their government. They must separate themselves from the capitalist class on election day, as they do every day in the year in their trades unions. The American Federation of Labor will be helpless, unless there is an American Labor Party alongside of it to elect a President and Governors, who would send neither troops nor militia to intimidate and shoot down strikers, judges who would turn a deaf ear to capitalists clamoring for injunctions, and legislators who would pass laws placing the rights of person, life and labor above the supposed rights of capital, and, under the power of eminent domain, declare the mines, the railroads, and all other means of production and distribution the common property of the whole nation, engraft upon our laws the admonition, "In the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat thy bread," abolish the system which breeds Morgans and Rockefellers on one side and

poverty and wretchedness on the other, and once more reassert the right of every man to life, liberty and pursuit of happiness.

Let every trades union and organization of labor fall in line and march hand in hand with the Socialist party to the polls on each election day, and a new page in the life-blood written history of American Labor will open, registering victory after victory in the onward march of the working class against the bulwarks of capitalism, until the whole structure of capitalism, with its government by injunction and bayonet, the rottenness, corruption and misery it creates, shall be replaced by the Republic of Labor.

GEO. B. LEONARD.

Minneapolis, Minn., Aug. 27, 1902.

Mr. Hennessey's Philosophy.

(A Rejoinder.)

ACAREFUL reading of Julian's "Thus Spake Marxist" (in the June Review) has enabled me to decipher in it the cryptogram of Mr. Hennessey. He does not worry over "unknowable problems which cannot be fathomed by the finite mind of man." "Glory be to hiven!" says he. "All I'm goin' to do is to vote." And, says he, "I will vote as I shoot." "With ye'er eyes shut?" commented Mr. Dooley. " 'Tis th' on'y way."

"He is in the procession (that is, Mr. Hennessey is), and cannot get out of it." How could he, with his eyes shut? Suppose, however, we look at things with our eyes open. What we are discussing is not the unconscious functions of the individual in society (only in that sense everybody may be said to be "in the procession"), but his conscious action, "class-conscious," if you please, with the emphasis on "conscious." And in this respect it is not true that everybody 'is in the procession and cannot get out of it,' just the opposite, the complaint in this neighborhood seems to be, that you cannot get 'em into it.

The "class struggle," of which we hear so much spoken, demands sacrifice from the individual for the benefit of his class. I anticipate the trivial objection that there is really no "sacrifice," since the individual derives pleasure from his seemingly unselfish acts. Yet the Belgian workmen who were shot down in the recent general strike, or the Jewish workmen in Russia who were whipped into insensibility for participating in the May day parade, suffered bodily pain, and this is no pleasure, all utilitarian talk to the contrary notwithstanding. One may vote with his eyes shut, but can you believe that those Jewish workmen made arrangements for and joined in the procession (in the literal sense) without stopping to think of "the reason why?" The majority of the Russian workmen stayed at home, could those few not have done likewise, if they would?

No, they could not—says Mr. Hennessey—for they could not have willed otherwise than they did. This is another objection that misses the point at issue.

It is not maintained that their will was "free," it had a determining psychical cause, or many causes, and it is these causes that we are endeavoring to ascertain. If we understand right the psychology of these workmen, each one is actuated by the belief that his personal effort adds something to the movement, and that the more numerous are those who share his belief and act upon it, the

greater will be the effect. The moment this belief is gone political apathy must ensue; so it was in Russia through the dark days of the '80s, when pessimism and Tolstoyism held sway. So the belief that the individual can influence the course of events is essential to public activity of a non-pecuniary character. That this belief is in contradiction with the assumption of "historical laws," is evident to any one whose reasoning faculty is not carried away by his desire to score a point in debate. If every event, such as the weather during Columbus' journey, is foreordained by "historical necessity," how can the individual change an iota by his efforts? Looking backward, if the discovery of America was bound to come on the 12th of October, 1492, neither sooner, nor later, how could human skill have changed even as much at the date? And now, looking forward, if the social revolution is due on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November of the year nineteen hundred and something, why should one jeopardize his daily bread and butter for the sake of it? The revolution will arrive on schedule time, rain or shine.

This is Mr. Hennessey's theory. , "Anything in history you do not understand?" says he in his familiar humorous vein—"say it was due to an accident and you are done with it." The implication is that there is not a thing "in heaven and earth" which is not accounted for in Mr. Hennessey's philosophy.

"What is an accident? And what is an accident not?" says he. Apparently, he has taken no cognizance of the development of historical science during the XIX. century. Our school books of history are full of episodical descriptions, i. e., of "accidents," modern philosophical treatises on history discard episodes and dates almost completely and concentrate their attention upon changes in the arts and mode of life, in institutions, religious beliefs, etc. The distinction between that which is "necessary" and that which is "accidental" has not originated with "Marxist," although it may have been from him that Mr. Hennessey first heard of it.

"In tracing the connection between phenomena—says Lavroff—as well as in ascertaining the distribution of forms, the first step always consists in distinguishing the more important from the less important. In phenomenological sciences, the naturalist can easily do it; what recurs in unvarying connection, is more important, for therein is the law; whatever relates to accidental modifications is of little importance and is noted merely for eventual reference at some future time. Probably no experimenter has ever found perfectly identical angles of refraction of light for the same medium, no one has obtained identical results by chemical analysis; but disregarding the accidental variations of the experiment, he

has discovered beneath them the invariable law of the recurrent phenomenon. That is the only thing that is essential."

"With man general laws alone are essential, not particular facts, because he understands a subject only by generalizing; but science with its general laws of phenomena is peculiar to man alone; without him there are only contemporaneous and consecutive chains of facts, so minute and particular that man can hardly perceive them in all their minuteness and particularity."*

What, then, is an accident? It is a particular variation of a recurrent phenomenon, something which has occurred once and may never occur again. It is unquestionably the effect of many minute causes, but they are unrelated to the recurrence of the phenomenon and are therefore disregarded in the generalization by which the scientific law is formulated. In this sense these variations are termed "accidental."

If you are conducting an entomological experiment and your laboratory is destroyed by a fire which started in the adjoining chemical laboratory, it is from the standpoint of the entomologist an accident. It does not mean that you do not know the cause of the fire; the fire may have been caused by an explosion which has been fully accounted for. But the cause of the fire is in no way related to the habits of the bugs under your observation, and for this reason it is for you an accident. Yet to the actuary of the insurance company it is no accident at all, it is but one of the recurrent phenomena comprised in his calculations. The distinction wholly depends upon the point of view; without such distinctions, however, no scientific analysis is possible.

Applying these propositions to a historical event, like the discovery of America by Columbus, on October 12, 1492, we can there discern certain features which are "necessary" or essential, and others which are "accidental." That the progress of astronomy and navigation was bound to result in the discovery of America, is plain enough; Norsemen had been on this continent centuries before; Columbus was not the first to seek the maritime route to India. So the discovery of America (an abstraction of our mind) was "historically necessary;" the concrete fact, however, that Columbus landed here on the 12th of October, 1492, was an "accident." It was due, says Mr. Hennessey, to favorable weather; precisely, but favorable weather was a fact over which astronomy and the art of navigation had no command. Unless it had been written beforehand in the Book of Destiny that Columbus was to land on the 12th of October, 1492, "two o'clock, three sharp," in Chicago justice court parlance, it is impossible to see how this chronological date can be accounted for by any "historical" or sociological law.

*P. Lavroff; *Historische Briefe*.

The attempt to smuggle in a distinction between "event" and "accident," and to construct upon it an imaginary contradiction, is certainly a clever move, which will be fully appreciated by all lovers of poker. Says Mr. Hennessey: "The laws of social development do not unfold themselves to us through all the events of our individual and collective careers, but only through the accidents of our individual and collective careers" (p. 846). The proposition is funny, but that is Mr. Hennessey's way. In the article he pretends to quote from, the words "event" and "accident" are used synonymously. To the sociological student every historical "event" is an "accident;" it is only in our mind that certain features of the event became detached from their associations and joined to similar features of other events, similarly detached from their associations; the outcome of this mental operation we call a sociological law.

Mr. Hennessey complains that the writer has not made it clear to him "what distinction he (Marxist) draws between 'laws of social development' and 'laws of history.'" Unfortunately, Mr. Hennessey reads as he votes—with his eyes shut—or else he could find the answer in the very article he criticizes, on p. 734 of the "Review:"

"There are no laws of history in the ordinary sense of the word, the so-called 'laws of history' being meant for sociological laws." Since the writer denies the existence of "laws of history" (the term being used throughout the article in quotation marks), it is hoped that he will be excused from "making clear" a "distinction," where there is no distinction. The ambiguity of the term "history" is responsible for the unscientific pretension to account for every concrete detail of an actual fact by "historic necessity." The Filipinos rose up against Spain about the time of the Spanish-American war—"historic necessity." Why? Because the Filipinos were in the revolution-making business (established 'way back), and, like shrewd business men, would not have missed such a chance for anything. Yet we know that the Poles "were in a state of rebellion most of the time "since the last partition of Poland; many a diplomat "anticipated an uprising" of Poland during the Crimean war, when the outlook for it was more favorable than either in 1831 or in 1863, when revolutions actually broke out; still it must have been "historic necessity" that the memories of Lord Palmerston and Napoleon III. should be put into shade by the foresight of Mr. Hennessey.

A sociological law is nothing but a generalization of the recurrent features in actual events; those features which do not recur, are not included in the generalization; consequently, it is futile to seek their explanation in sociological laws. All such variations can be accounted for by acts of individuals, due to in-

dividual causes, which are wholly unrelated to the sociological law in question. The sociologist disregards these variations, though each of them may affect the lives of two or three generations; yet to the sociologist two or three generations of men are the same as to the entomologist two or three generations of grasshoppers.

In a democracy like the United States the part played by the individual in historical events is less susceptible to observation than in an absolute monarchy where only a few individuals perform active political functions. An example taken from the recent political history of Russia will therefore serve best to illustrate the preceding propositions.

On the 13th of March, 1881, at 12:30 p. m., Czar Alexander II. approved a bill calling for a constitutional convention, and ordered it to be promulgated. Two hours later he was assassinated and his successor refused to carry out his father's policy. These are historical facts. Is it pure speculation to ask, what would have happened had the plot to assassinate the Czar miscarried on that particular day? Similar attempts failed more than once, before and after. The Czar was an old and sickly man; a slight indisposition might have changed his arrangements for that particular day. A delay of a few days would have given him time to promulgate his policy, and we may reasonably infer from the address of the Executive Committee to his successor* that this would have averted the catastrophe. Russia will some day have a constitutional government. This is a "historic necessity." Other nations have obtained it at a less advanced stage of economic and intellectual development than Russia. The struggle for it has been going on since the insurrection of 1825; it may take another twenty-five or fifty years, yet it might have succeeded twenty years ago. The difference of fifty years is here plainly the result of a mere accident.

What is the inference? That actions of individuals may hasten or delay the course of events, and, as a corollary, that no actual event is "historically necessary." The conception of "necessity" relates only to an abstraction of our mind, not to any actual occurrence. So when we say that "public ownership of public utilities" is a "historical necessity," we simply predict that a number of federal and state laws and municipal ordinances will be enacted from time to time, each dealing specifically with some public utility. (They could not possibly be enacted all on the same day, even should they eventually come as a result of a "revolution," whatever one may understand by it.) It is only the common principle (an abstraction) embodied in these acts that is said to be "necessary," the particular act is not. Every such act is the work

*See George Kennan's "Siberia and the Exile System," Vol. II.

of individuals; its passage will as a rule depend upon the action or inaction of a few individuals.

The generalizations are of the domain of Sociology; Sociology is therefore all "law" and "necessity." The particular acts make up the contents of History, and as every particular act is the work of individuals, so we may say that "men make History." A proper understanding of the laws of social development will enable the individual to direct his energy along the line of least resistance, or "to do in Rome as Romans do," as my friend Hennessey says. On the contrary, a misconception of the tendencies of social evolution may result in a Don-Quixotic policy, whose effect will be the reverse of that expected.

MARXIST.

Semi-Annual Report of the National Committee of the Socialist Party.

St. Louis, Mo., September 12, 1902.

To the Members of the Socialist Party.

Comrades: Your National Committee, in submitting its semi-annual report, deems it wise to confine itself to a statement of the difficulties confronting the party in order that the membership, being possessed of the facts, may take appropriate action.

While Socialist sentiment has increased throughout the country with marked rapidity, and while many very gratifying changes have taken place in our movement, we must in all candor say that the party organization has not been equal to the opportunities presented thereby. Since the last national convention the movement has been divided into as many parties as there are States, each directed by a state committee proceeding in its own weak fashion and according to its own conception of principles and tactics, with the result that the Socialist party to-day is no stronger than the strongest state organization affiliated. Instead of being a united party, we are fast becoming a mere "federation of Socialist Parties," each of these parties having its territorial limits and jealously guarding against any encroachment upon its domain.

Such a condition has led to endless confusion and needless waste of energy and funds.

Each state committee is bearing the burden of nursing an infant Socialist Party, and thus doing in each state what the party did on a national scale many years ago. Consequently, regardless of their good intentions, they are unable to properly meet their obligations to the National Organization.

In matters of organization and propaganda the desire of most state committees to till their own field makes us appear as an army of truck farmers instead of the "bonanza" farmers we might be were our operations conducted on a national scale. The most serious danger lies in questions of principles and tactics. The practical independence of the state organizations from the party as a whole makes it possible for young and inexperienced state committees to place the party in many painful and contradictory situations.

We recommend a careful study of the situation by all comrades, and set forth below some of the facts which lead us to the opinions herein expressed.

Financial.

At this time Illinois, Oklahoma and Wisconsin are in arrears for July and August; Nebraska and New York for June, July and

August; and Kansas and North Dakota since March. The National Constitution makes it mandatory upon state committees to pay national dues monthly, but the national Committee has no power to enforce this provision, which the state committees for the most part have not lived up to.

In Kansas, the dues system having been abolished, the state committee collects no dues from the comrades and pays no dues to the National Organization.

Thus, although its fixed expenses are increasing in proportion to the growth of the movement, the fluctuating revenues of the National Organization cause serious embarrassment at all times.

Methods of State Committees.

The National Constitution requires the state committees to make semi-annual reports, but the National Committee has no power to enforce this provision, which is not being observed. The absence of reports from state committees leaves the National Committee in the dark about conditions in the states.

In remitting national dues, the state committees, as a rule, do not state what locals have paid, nor on what month the dues apply, nor the number of members paid for by each local.

As a consequence, the National Secretary is unable to determine whether the states are forwarding their full quota of national dues.

It has been impossible since the Unity Convention to determine the number of locals and membership of the party in the United States, in the absence of reports by the state committees. This condition of affairs is attended with many dangers. Should a State Secretary for any reason be absent from his post, it is possible that neither the state or national organizations would know the names and locations of locals in the state. One instance of this kind occurred recently in Nebraska. The state committee of Wisconsin has refused a list of its locals up to the present time. Were this example generally followed we could not reach the membership in any national emergency.

Propaganda.

In order to meet the requirements of the movement for widespread propaganda, the National Committee started the Labor Lecture Bureau. That it is the most economic and far-reaching system of propaganda ever inaugurated in the Socialist movement is proven by requests for speakers from trade unions and party organizations in every state and territory, but the operations of this Lecture Bureau cannot be extended under existing conditions. National dues being diverted or withheld by state committees, the National Committee is helpless to furnish a national system of agitation. The locals, being thrown on their own re-

sources, are obliged to pay extravagantly for individual propaganda. The amount of money spent in planless propaganda in one month, by state committees and locals, would enable the National Committee to maintain a corps of clear and able speakers for one year, under the systematic and economic method of the Labor Lecture Bureau, with the added advantage of reaching into the trade union movement.

Agitation as at present conducted is sectional, being confined to the territory which can pay high prices for speakers.

A proper Socialist agitation is one that reaches into every section of the country, and regulates the cost with consideration for the scant funds of the proletarian organizations.

Party Organization.

The National Constitution gives the state committees sole control of all matters pertaining to organization within the respective states, and as a result a division of energy has been created, depriving the National Organization of the national co-operation necessary to send organizers into unorganized states.

The work of organization as conducted exclusively by state committees has in some instances been totally neglected, in others it languishes or is being conducted spasmodically, while in no instance have the results reached the degree of efficiency and stability that will in the end only be achieved by national co-operative effort.

The whole work of organization is segregated, sectional and at cross purposes.

Under the present system the state committees cannot insure permanency of employment to comrades most highly qualified as organizers, to induce them to undertake the work of the party.

Tactics and Principles.

The separation of the party into state organizations, each being supreme in its own state, holds forth a prospect of political advantage, very tempting to certain men. As a result, there have been factional fights in five states. Under the operation of the National Constitution, the National Committee cannot interfere to prevent or settle such troubles before they reach a serious stage, but must wait until there is a split in the state.

Such a struggle is now in progress in Nebraska. The fact that organizations in new states consist of elements inexperienced in the philosophy and tactics of the international Socialist movement naturally leads to political expressions, platforms and party tactics which conflict with Socialist principles and practices, and which are essentially middle class.

The factional fight in Utah was largely caused by such con-

ditions, and the National Committee could not interfere until there was a split and rival state committees to deal with.

The independent tendencies of the state organizations find expression in different tactics by different states on questions of national policy, so that while the National Committee may be attempting to rally the comrades of the country on a certain line of action, conflicting policies may be urged by one or more state committees. This confusion in organization and in tactics is well illustrated at this time by many of our comrades who seem to think that Socialist principles are justification for applauding a division on Socialist lines between the economic organizations of the working class.

While the Socialist party in national convention has solemnly pledged itself to the unification of the trade unions, yet a contrary policy has been set up in the West by comrades acting in a dual capacity as organizers of the American Labor Union and the Socialist party, thus misrepresenting the attitude of our party and compromising it in their attempts to build up a rival organization to the American Federation of Labor.

Conclusions.

The expense of holding the National Committee meeting in January last amounted to almost \$700. As there are now twice as many organized states as were then represented, the next meeting would cost about \$1,500.

The National Organization has not a cent toward meeting this expense, and if same is deducted as before by the states represented from funds due the National Committee, it will cause a recurrence of existing embarrassment, which not alone deprives the National Committee of sufficient funds for current expenses, but subjects us to the mortification of pleading constant bankruptcy to creditors of former national committees and humiliates your Local Quorum, which must henceforth decline to endure this condition. Furthermore, we do not believe that a meeting of the National Committee would suffice to thoroughly and decisively solve the problems herein presented; it would not bring about the general degree of understanding required between the comrades upon party policy and tactics.

The indefinite continuance of the present laxity of organization and confusion in methods so threatens the stability of our party that, no other means being sufficient to meet the emergency, we suggest to the consideration of the comrades such constitutional steps as may be necessary for holding a national convention of the Socialist party.

Meanwhile the conditions at present existing can be partially alleviated if the comrades in the delinquent states will hold their

respective state committees accountable in their dealings with the
National Organization.

Fraternally,

G. A. Hoehn,

M. Ballard Dunn,

Wm. Brandt,

L. E. Hillebrand,

E. Val. Putnam,

Local Quorum.

A Correction.

Van Buren, Ark., Aug. 25, 1902.

A. M. Simons, Editor International Socialist Review.

My Dear Comrade: The Cincinnati Enquirer, of the edition of August 22d, publishes a scare-head article anent my so-called resignation from the Catholic priesthood and asserts that "the reason assigned for his withdrawal from the ministry and communion of the Catholic Church, Father Hagerty states, is the church's stand against Socialism and the incompatibility of her teachings with the doctrines of his economic creed." I have never made such a statement. While it is true that I have withdrawn from the technical work of the ministry, the withdrawal implies no derogation of my sacerdotal character. I am as much a priest to-day as I ever was. I have not separated myself from the communion of the Catholic Church; and I hold myself as much a member thereof as the Pope himself.

The enemies of Socialism will stop at nothing to discredit its mission. The political bigot seeks always some prejudice or pretext of religion to warrant his attack upon the adversaries of his party; and the lines of Boileau need no new rendition for our day:

*"Qui méprise Cotin n'estime point son roi,
Et n'a selon Cotin, ni Dieu, ni foi, ni loi."*

I have no economic creed. A creed supposes faith; and faith is the receiving of doctrine upon authority. Knowledge, on the contrary, is the direct recognition of truth by the intellect. One may have a religious belief, but not an economic creed. I do not believe in any economic creed, but I know the definite philosophy of Socialism. It is the utmost absurdity to speak of the incompatibility of Catholicism and Socialism. No one would dream of going into a meat market and asking for a Catholic beef-steak, a Methodist mutton chop, or a Presbyterian ham. Religion has no more to do with Socialism than it has with meat and bread. Socialism is an economic science, not a system of dogmatic beliefs. It is wholly beyond the scope of the church's mission to deal with questions of social economy, just as it is beyond the purpose of the Republican party to advance a new exegesis of the Davidic Psalms.

Bishops and priests exceed their authority when they use the influence of their position to oppose a movement whose highest purpose is the industrial liberation of the wage slaves of the world. According to the strictest interpretations of moral theology, Catholics are not bound to pay *any* attention to them in

such matters. The Pope's encyclicals on the question have no more authority than that which attaches to the opinions of any private theologian. The function of his office is confined strictly to matters of faith and morals. His judgment upon a canvas of Fra Angelico or a fragment of the Tel-el-Armana tablets is as much open to criticism as that of any other scholar.

It is to be regretted that a few bishops and priests, out of the abundance of their ignorance, have seen fit to attack the principles of Socialism, but it does not, therefore, follow that the doctrines of the church, as such, are in conflict with the truths of Socialism. The churchmen of the primitive days were genuine Socialists—men like St. John Chrysostom, who denounced the Capitalism of his day in the most acid words of the wondrous Greek in which he preached. With Whittier, rightly may

"I sigh for men as bold
As those bearded priests of old.

"Now too oft the priesthood wait
At the threshold of the state—
Waiting for the beck and nod
Of its power as law and God."

Nevertheless, I thank God that such men as Father McGrady are gradually opening the eyes of Catholics to a sense of their rights in the field of industry and to a recognition of their individual freedom in all things outside of the fixed lines of dogma and revelation.

THOS. J. HAGERTY, A. M., S. T. B.

The Tenement Mother.

ILOVED my life while yet I was a child
Joy pulsed in heart and brain. The wind, the wild
Sweet bloom of spring, the summer rain, the year's
Bright afterglow—each spoke to eager ears
A message eloquent of beauty mild.
At times my poignancy of joy drew tears.

I loved my life when I was grown a maid,
When years of tribute to kind Nature paid
And many a poet's page that richly gleamed,
Had increase brought of joy. Then earth me-seemed
A garden full of guests whose mirth naught stayed.
Then saw I visions; yea, and fair dreams dreamed.

But now I love no more my life. Instead
Are loved these helpless lives that have been led
With care and patience since their days begun;
And much was needed as the long weeks ran.
They call me early from a half-slept bed
With fretful cries, as ailing infants can.

How can I love my life or joy—Ah, me!
In theirs, when all the long, hot days I see
Them droop their heads—like lily-stalks in drouth—
And paler grow, and piteous at the mouth,
By reason of the life that theirs must be
In these close rooms that search the torrid south.

Sometimes in dreams to love my life I dare;
For them I see a cool green wood and there,
All quiet in the shade, a tiny cot
With steep-pitched roof and cheerful chimney-pot
And porches wide, and comfort everywhere—
O God, of all Thy soil, for me no spot?

Methinks, indeed, I still could love my life
And revel in my children's happy strife,
Should such a home prove mine (not merely seem),
Dear to me there in every board and beam,
As babe that grows beneath my heart towards life.
This now my cherished vision, this my dream.

ISABEL N. WILDER.

EDITORIAL

A Discordant Note.

This is the last issue which will reach our readers before election. On the eve of war it is worth while to take a glance at the strength of our forces. It is hard to keep from superlatives in describing the progress of the socialist movement during the past year. There is scarcely a State that is not showing a growth far beyond what any one would have predicted who was present at the Indianapolis convention one year ago last July. Out on the Pacific coast, the State of Washington is roused as never before. The rapidly growing and ever improving Seattle Socialist is filled with reports of enthusiastic county conventions in localities never before invaded by socialism, while several active agitators are constantly working where hitherto none were known.

Oregon is moving almost if not quite as fast; while California seems ablaze throughout her entire length. So rapidly is socialism growing in that State that it is a poor week that does not turn out at least one new socialist paper from California. From San Francisco comes news that would indicate that the Union Labor party had already found its natural place in the ranks of the socialist movement. Los Angeles, with one of the most active and best edited papers in the country, will certainly be heard from when election returns are counted.

Idaho was an almost unknown territory to the socialist explorer of but a year ago. To-day the Idaho Socialist has just been incorporated with a capital stock of \$10,000 and promises immediate enlargement. The news columns of this paper indicate that few spots will remain uninfected by the socialist virus by election time. In Utah, whether because of, or in spite of, national interference, we have two socialist papers in practically the same locality and largely antagonistic. But both factions show such good sense and such an utter lack of the personal abuse that have so often marked socialist controversies in the past that we feel sure it will not be long until we shall see a solidly united socialist movement in this State. Meanwhile the activity which both are showing for the ticket which has been nominated promises well for the coming election.

When one comes to Colorado the enthusiasm begins to mount high. Capitalist politicians grant us from fifty to seventy thousand votes and the election of a large number of local officials, several members of the Legislature and, probably, a Congressman. Whether these hopes can

be fulfilled or not time alone can tell, but it is certain that the comrades at the base of the Rockies are putting up by far the strongest fight that has ever been made by any single State in the Union. They have done this, furthermore, without any assistance from the other States and, indeed, with something of opposition.

In Montana and the Dakotas socialism is springing up on every hand, even in localities apparently untouched by socialist propaganda. Perhaps the situation through this whole locality is better expressed by a recent report of Comrade Chase than by anything we could possibly say in the matter.

"The population of these States is made up of social rebels who have come from all parts of the country to the west in search for freedom from the oppression of capitalism in the east or in quest of fortune in the gold fields. They are, therefore, made up of freedom-loving, whole-souled people who are not tied down by bigotry and ignorance and made cowardly by fear of losing a six-dollar-a-week job. They are more free than is the worker of the east, and they see that the conditions under which the eastern mill and factory hand and mine worker labors is liable to overtake them and they are ready to fight it. The west will furnish the great impetus to the Socialist movement, and this in the near future. The western wealth producer will not allow himself to be subjected to the degrading and humiliating servitude of the eastern wage slave. He will strike a blow with the ballot, that will not only prevent his enslavement but one that will strike the shackles from the limbs of his eastern brethren."

The Missouri comrades have made great inroads upon the ranks of the pure and simple unions and are taking advantage of the nauseating bootlicking in St. Louis politics to lead the laborers out of the general rottenness of capitalist politics into the socialist movement.

In Kansas and Nebraska we hear stories of State conventions with 300 delegates where 20 would have been considered a crowd a few years ago, and the promise is made of a rousing campaign in the near future.

Illinois has increased her number of Locals more than tenfold in the last year and will have three agitators steadily in the field from now until election, where there has never been an attempt to maintain more than one heretofore, while a number of volunteer speakers will be sent to different parts of the State as called upon. In several of the districts there is at least a fighting chance of the election of a man to the Legislature and the certainty of a largely increased vote.

Wisconsin has just held a State convention that was by far the largest ever known in her history and will maintain several organizers in the field. Indeed, the Wisconsin comrades are claiming that they will lead the procession of the States in Socialist votes this fall.

Indiana is another State in which Socialism is penetrating into the uttermost corner. In Evansville, for example, the trades unions are almost unanimous for Socialism. Several local Socialist papers have already been started or are in preparation in different towns, numerous organizers have been working through the State, and the number of Locals is growing with great rapidity. Literature is being distributed in large quantities and unless signs fail, this State will be a surprise

to many who have not been watching the quiet though energetic campaign which has been carried on by the Socialists of that State.

Ohio is another State where the work has been continuous, systematic and extensive, reaching into new fields and laying the foundations for a strong movement in the future.

Pennsylvania, like Colorado, gives occasion for the most extravagant hopes. It is now thoroughly recognized that the great coal strike has been the mightiest propaganda movement for Socialism that this or any other country has ever seen. Throughout the length and breadth of the Keystone State the laborers are awakening in rebellion. Comrade Warde of Erie is practically certain of election to the Legislature, where he will find Socialist colleagues from Schuylkill, Wilkesbarre and Luzerne. A quotation from a recent report of the Pennsylvania Secretary will give an idea of the way things are moving there:

"The straits to which the old parties are put by our agitation is shown by their begging Socialists to vote at their primaries. One paper says: 'A primary vote is not governed by the vote a man intends to cast at the next election. Republicans who voted the party ticket last fall and who have lately affiliated themselves with the Socialist party, cannot be deprived of the right to vote on Saturday.' The Socialists stayed away from the polls just the same and to-day a Republican cannot be found in that town that will tell how many votes were cast by his party.

"There is a story that was told Governor Stone of this State when interested persons were trying to get him to settle the strike. 'In Schuylkill County to-day,' said Mr. Wilhelm, 'the Socialist party has put a full ticket in the field. When the referendum was submitted to the Socialist organizations on a vote for a candidate for the State Senate to succeed Senator Higgins, one candidate received 1,700 votes and the other 1,600, making 2,300 votes they have in their 27 organizations, and if this strike keeps on they will have 127 organizations on election day. The head of the organization is an intelligent man, a client of mine, with a son at Dickinson College, and he is the last man I thought to see lead a band of Socialists.'"

The New York Worker tells of 300,000 pieces of literature being ordered in one week for a campaign in that State and a half-dozen speakers are carrying the good news into ever new districts.

Little New Jersey has arranged to put three speakers into the field continuously from now until election. This should suffice to reach most of the voters in that State.

Down in Massachusetts it seems probable that Comrades Carey and McCartney will, in the future, not find themselves standing alone in their opposition to the capitalist parties, as there is a promise that other Socialists will be sent to join them in the Legislature. A straw that shows how things are blowing in that State is furnished by the action of the Springfield Central Labor Union, which has recently responded to the call of the Milwaukee Trades Council for a new Labor Party by saying that the Socialist Party filled the bill and no new party was required. Old Faneuil Hall very recently was given a sensation which must have reminded it of the good old times of 1776. A "Conciliation" meeting had been called to show the common interests of capital and

labor in the coal mines. Things went very smoothly until Comrades Carey and McCartney got onto the floor, when the meeting stampeded for Socialism and indorsed a Socialist resolution almost unanimously.

"Oh, have you heard the news from Maine? How it went"—100 per cent gained for the Socialist Party. We are now an official party in this State and only two campaigns gone by.

While we write this news comes that the last region to resist Socialism has at last been invaded. The solid South, the black belt, has given way before the advance of the social revolution. Alabama is now in the field with a full State ticket, has her local agitation leaflets, and has arranged to make a full campaign.

Into the midst of this general chorus of exultation and encouraging voices comes a discordant note in the shape of the "Semi-annual Report of the National Executive Committee," so-called, which is published elsewhere in this number. We say "so-called" advisedly, for while the report bears this high-sounding title it carries only the names of the five St. Louis comrades who constitute the "Local Quorum," something quite different from the N. E. C., and there is no reason to believe that the latter ever lent their sanction to such a document.

The first impression this "Report" makes is one of amazement at its astounding impudence, and the insulting language used toward the party membership by those who are but party employees. At a time when a dozen State committees are doing more each week than the national officials have done since their election, it sounds rather strange to hear this local quorum talking of "each . . . State Committee proceeding in its own weak fashion." In the same way such phrases as "young and inexperienced State committees" comes with ill-grace from a body of men, a majority of whom have been in party work a much shorter time than the State committees criticised. Neither have we yet heard that any of these State committees have placed the party in any situation one-half as "painful and contradictory" as that in which the Local Quorum has placed the whole party by its meddling and officious resolution in the matter of the American Labor Union.

In this connection a word of explanation may be necessary as to our attitude on the question of the A. L. U., especially as it has been claimed that the editorial which appeared in the August number of this Review inspired the resolutions. We still believe that had the Western Federation of Miners made some effort at conciliation, which efforts we are now certain would have been rejected, it would have strengthened their subsequent position. Neither do we see that their declaration for Socialism was in any way intimately connected with their announced determination to invade the East and establish rival unions to the A. F. L. But neither of these positions would justify us individually in maintaining an attitude of hostility to the A. L. U. in favor of the A. F. of L., and there was nothing whatever in the editorial mentioned which gives ground for the statement that our attitude was one of hostility toward the A. L. U. But the main point in this connection is that the N. E. C., and still less the Local Quorum had no right to make any opinion, whether of this Review or any other individual or set of individuals, the "official" position of the party.

The whole attitude of the Local Quorum on this matter has been di-

rected toward giving the impression that the Indianapolis convention organized, not a Socialist party, but an annex to the A. F. of L. The question of the proper attitude toward the western comrades (who, whatever else may be said of them, are doing tenfold the Socialist propaganda done by the national headquarters) is something upon which the Socialist party has taken no stand whatever, and the attempt to curry favor with the reactionary, not say fakir, element in the A. F. of L. by claims to the contrary is wholly unjustified, to say the least. The Socialist party has not yet spoken on that subject, and the five St. Louis Socialists who pretend to speak in the name of that party are making themselves as ridiculous as the original "Three Tailors of Tooley Street."

The main whine of the "Report" is on the non-payment of dues, always a tender subject with official bodies. But the list of delinquent States shows that Illinois and Wisconsin, who have always stood for State autonomy, are less delinquent than those strenuous advocates of centralization,—New York and Nebraska.

The statement that "the amount of money spent in planless propaganda in one month by State committees and locals would enable the National Committee" to perform such wonders, is not only insulting to the State committees, but decidedly ridiculous in view of the little that the national officers have accomplished with the something over \$3,500 which they have had during the last six months. They have used the money which they have had in multiplying office expenses beyond all sense, and what little has been spent for propaganda has been largely employed in sending organizers into States already organized, sometimes against the protest of State committees, whose much better prepared plans were thereby disarranged, while suspicion and misunderstanding were aroused in local movements and disorganization spread among the already organized. That more harm was not actually accomplished was due to the fact that the comrades who were sent out as organizers were infinitely more tactful and intelligent than those who sent them.

The statement that "certain men" are seeking "political advantage" through State autonomy is a cowardly libel worthy of a Hickey or a Keep that should be at once proven or apologized for and withdrawn. Otherwise it will be easy for some one to retort that centralization may offer "political advantages" to "certain officials," a charge which, we believe, would be equally false and contemptible, but more excusable after the issuance of this circular.

The reference to local factional fights carries no weight unless accompanied by evidence that national interference has been helpful in the States where attempted, something which we believe to be hardly susceptible of proof. Indeed, there is every reason to believe from the attitude and language of the present circular that had the party not very wisely curbed the power of the Local Quorum in the direction of State interference, we would now have, not even a "federation of Socialist parties," but a number of wholly unconnected parties.

The "Conclusion" forms a fitting climax to the whole circular. After scolding, abusing and snarling at the party membership they have the impudence to suggest that that membership be punished by being

forced to hold a convention to give these same men more power,—a proceeding that would cost not less than \$25,000 and occupy the attention of the entire party for several months to the complete exclusion of the real business of propaganda and organization. Permit us to suggest that there are at least two other alternatives. The first and best is for the Local Quorum to submit to the will of the convention electing them, curb their exalted opinions of their own importance and confine themselves to the work for which they were elected,—that of organizing the unorganized territory and acting as a means of communication between the party organizations. If this is impossible and they really feel they "must decline to endure this condition" any longer then their resignations are in order as a much simpler and easier solution of the difficulty than the proposed convention.

These criticisms and conclusions may seem harsh, but they are mild compared with the criticisms and conclusions contained in the Report. Moreover, if anyone feels that we have been unjust, the columns of this Review are open to any member of the Local Quorum or any of their defenders, who may object to the positions here taken. We regret that our national officers have seen fit to precipitate such discussion in the midst of a campaign, but if any evil results to the cause of Socialism, it is upon them that the odium must rest. We feel sure, however, that the cause of Socialism is now too strong in this country to be greatly affected by any such a "palace revolution," and that the membership will be able to discuss and dispose of the matter without any injurious friction.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

E. Untermann.

Germany.

The report of the National Committee of the German Social Democratic Party to the national convention in Muenchen, held September 14th, shows that the agrarian tariff has been one of the best means of agitation which the party has ever had. The documents protesting against the tariff bore no less than 3,431,784 signatures. A recent dispatch of the Associated Press supplements this with the report that a speaker at the convention expected the party to receive three million Socialist votes and 100 seats at the next Reichstag's election. The party has carried on a tremendous agitation, in spite of the officious interference of the police, which seems to be a source of much fun to the comrades, judging by their good-natured and jocular comments on the helmeted guardians of the peace. In this connection, it is interesting to note what constitutes a legal cause for dissolving a Socialist meeting in Saxony: To discuss social conditions in a loud voice; if the policeman attending the meeting has cold feet; if the speaker mentions the devil; if the audience applauds a speaker who is called to order; if the policeman thinks the meeting lasts too long. This explains why Saxony has the greatest number of Socialists in municipal councils. In Leipzig, the police forbade any meetings, in which tickets were sold and plays enacted, shortly before the annual picnic of the Socialists was due. The next number of the party organ calmly announced, that the committee in charge had prepared a holiday number for the picnic and advised the comrades to buy it as soon as possible, so that the police department would "not regard the buying of the holiday number as a circumvention of its decree." The holiday number was such a howling success that the police department canceled its decree, and the laughing Socialists had the pleasure of increasing their funds still more by selling tickets at the gate.

A demand for a thorough reform of the election laws has been placed on the minutes of the legislatures, and although no positive results have been obtained, the sentiment in favor of this reform is widespread and cannot be long resisted by the bourgeois parties.

The party press is now composed of one central organ, "Vorwaerts," one scientific review, "Neue Zeit," 54 dailies, 10 appearing thrice a week, 4 twice a week, 7 weeklies, one fortnightly, 2 monthlies, 2 fortnightly satirical papers, 2 weekly illustrated family papers, and one

fortnightly paper, "Gleichheit," for proletarian women. The trade union press consists of one appearing thrice a week, 32 weeklies, 2 thrice a month, 21 twice a month, and 11 monthlies.

The total income of "Vorwaerts" amounted to 679,380.80 mark, the total expense to 618,778.95, leaving a balance of 60,601.85 mark in the treasury. The Vorwaerts-Buchhandlung did business to the amount of 193,754 mark and paid 15,000 mark into the party treasury, which has a surplus of 15,035.56 mark.

The number of female "Vertrauenspersonen" (trustees), has doubled since 1901 and is now 50. The locals of the three Hamburg election districts have the highest number of female comrades, 902. In Saxony, the twelfth and thirteenth election districts have 550 organized women, other Saxon districts have 194 and 180. The income of "Gleichheit" during the last year was 2,900.29 mark, the expense 2,195.55 mark, leaving a favorable balance of 704.74 mark.

The convention was opened by comrade Singer who welcomed the foreign delegates. Austria had sent comrades Seliger, Adler, Pernerstorfer, Seitz, Abram, Zelger, Filger-Haas, Nemeic, and the female comrades Popp, Pohl and Schlesinger. England was represented by comrade Askew, of the S. D. F., Belgium and France by comrade Vandervelde, Italy by comrade Lerda, Switzerland by comrade Mueller. The foreign delegates made short speeches in their own languages. Numerous telegrams from the Socialist parties of other countries reached the desk of the chairman. Ninety-one different resolutions from all parts of the empire were presented to the convention. The female comrades, represented by 25 delegates, deliberated in separate convention.

The proceedings were carried through without a hitch. The character of the party as a champion of the working class and of a higher order of human society was clearly expressed in Bebel's speech on the coming Reichstag's elections. It was the great challenge to the capitalist parties for 1903. It was the declaration of war against the enemies of the working class who increase the price of the necessities of life to producers, against the exploiters of labor power, against the henchmen of capitalist justice, against the capitalist state and the nobility and clericalism that uphold it, against militarism and colonial conquests, against all wrong and oppression. It clearly emphasized, in the words of "Vorwaerts" that "wherever the representatives of Socialism gather there is the nation's true civilization and freedom."

England.

The British trade unions held their annual convention in London on September 6th. While the convention did not make any radical departure from the old policy, still the dawn of light is visible in the resolutions adopted. A resolution denouncing the South African war was adopted with 591,000 against 314,000 votes. The convention appointed a parliamentary committee and instructed it to confer with all labor bodies that are in favor of independent political action. The

Socialists even succeeded in passing a resolution demanding the collective ownership of the means of production and exchange. How little such resolutions mean without a recognition of the class struggle, we have seen in the American Knights of Labor. Also the convention did not accept the invitation of the International Socialist Bureau in Brussels to send delegates to the International Congress in 1903. It was recognized, that the Taff-Vale decision threatened the very existence of the trade unions, and a demand was made for new legislation defining the status of the unions. New Zealand arbitration was defeated by a vote of 961,000 against 303,000. Sam Woods was re-elected secretary by a majority of 823,000. A great demonstration was made in Hyde Park, where Shackleton, Keir Hardie and John Burns delivered radical speeches. The English trade unions, like the man who squirms around the dentist's office before he has his tooth pulled, take a long time before they accept the inevitable—the Socialist platform.

Italy.

The National Convention of the Italian Socialist Party, held in Imola on September 6th to 8th, settled the vexing question of the two tendencies in a very amicable manner by declaring them a "division of labor which does not disturb the unity of the party." The party has splendidly developed and consists now of 1,336 locals with 51,415 members in Italy and 49 locals with 1,703 members in France, England, Germany, and Switzerland. In 1895, the party had only 442 locals with 19,121 members. The vote on the question of tactics showed plainly that the revolutionary wing is gaining ground. Comrade Ferri offered the following resolution which was defeated with 456 against 279 votes:

Whereas, The action of the Socialist Party must be determined by its revolutionary character; every reform must be gained by the working class itself, and must be co- and subordinated to the general purpose, viz., the political and economic transformation of the present order of society, which must be carried through by the proletariat organized as a class party; and whereas, the unity of the Party is not endangered by the simultaneous existence of two tendencies and tactics;

Resolved, That the Socialist Party must pursue its political and economic aims independently and separately from any other class, sect, or political party.

The following resolution, introduced by comrade Bonomi, was adopted, the division of the house being the same:

Whereas, all reforms that ameliorate the economic, political and moral conditions of the proletariat, or that obstruct capitalist exploitation, operate effectively toward the attainment of the aim of the social revolution, collectivism;

The convention declares that this conception is incompatible with the existence of two distinct tendencies based on substantial differences and affirms that the action of the party is reformatory because

revolutionary and revolutionary because reformatory, or that the action of the party is simply Socialist;

The convention recognizes the fundamental law of the variety of forces that serve a uniform aim and confirms, for eventual alliances with popular parties, the tactics adopted by the convention of Rome for the autonomy of the sections, with such restraints as local or provincial conventions may impose for the purpose of preventing the manifestation of evident aberrations from Socialism;

The convention, firm in the democratic conception that the political representation must reflect as directly as possible the sovereignty of the masses and disappear, so to say, in an intimate and direct contact between representatives and represented, declares that the Socialist group in parliament is autonomous in its actions, but must keep in continual touch with the mind and will of the great mass of proletarians, toward whom the political organizations of the party have the plain duty to stimulate and keep awake the spirit of criticism, of control by frequent meetings and unceasing propaganda, of organization and of political education;

And recognizing that, however deplorable the vacillating and often unliberal attitude of the present Cabinet may be, the support given to it by our party succeeded in safeguarding the development of proletarian organization against a possible relapse into reactionary attacks, the convention approves of the work of the Socialist group in Parliament and advises it to maintain the most absolute liberty of action in parliamentary questions against the government and the other parties, remembering that all coalitions with other than proletarian parties must necessarily be only transitory expedients, and must be closed for the purpose of palpable advantages to the party, and with the consciousness of their certain dissolution in the future.

The convention finally hopes that the reaffirmed unity of the party will signify the beginning of a new and more fertile era of Socialist propaganda and organization."

Both Ferri and Turati declared their satisfaction with the result in their closing speeches.

The representatives of the party in parliament remain independent in their decisions, but it was emphasized that they must be in touch with the views and wishes of the great mass of the proletariat. A street parade of five thousand Socialists of both sexes closed the convention.

Norway.

The Norwegian Socialists held their national convention on August 22-25. The party has made good progress during the last year.

From July 1, 1901, to June 30, 1902, 76 locals joined the party, which now has 211 locals with about 12,000 members. Agitation meetings were held in 150 towns. The Socialist Young People's clubs have been a great assistance to the party. Votes increased considerably, but in consequence of lack of employment a great number lost their franchise, in Christiania alone over 4,000 men since 1900. Women in the

cities took part in the elections up to 48 per cent, in the country only 9.4 per cent. A collection for the party organ yielded 2,093.22 kroner. "Ny Tid," the organ of the Trondhjem comrades, is to become a daily. The following resolution as to tactics was adopted: Alliances with other political parties are only admissible on condition of a satisfactory allotment of candidates to the Socialist party, but under no condition must the program be violated. No local has the right to form an alliance without the consent of the central committee of the party.

France.

The national convention of the Parti Socialiste de France (Unite Revolutionnaire) was held in Commentry (Allier) on September 26th to 28th. The different points discussed were: Reports of the Central Committee; report of the representatives in the chamber; report of the federations; examination of the elections of 1902 and their consequences; organization of the party; the international congress in 1903; election of executive committees. Further details will be given next month.

The 20th national convention of the Parti Ouvrier Francais was held on September 21st and following days. The program was similar to that mentioned above. Detailed news has not yet reached us.

Switzerland.

The capitalist judges had declared the recent election in Ausser-siehl (Zurich), in which the Socialists won a great victory, null and void. A re-election became necessary on September 1st. In the previous election, 9,271 voters went to the polls. This time 9,571 came. The highest number of Socialist votes in the previous election was 5,932, the lowest 4,362. The new election brought us from 6,318 to 5,024 votes. The Socialists gained almost twice as many seats as the bourgeois parties. In Bern, comrade Langhans was elected president of the Court with 1,598 votes against 1,468 of all bourgeois parties.

Holland.

The election in the ninth district in Amsterdam for parliament resulted in a great victory for comrade Troelstra. At the general elections in 1901, only 877 Socialist votes were cast. This time the Socialist vote was 2,050. In 1901 the liberals received 29 per cent of the vote, but now only 15; the clericals in 1901 had 34 per cent, now only 30; the radicals maintained their 18 per cent; but the percentage of the Socialists rose from 19 to 37 per cent in a single year.

Japan.

Comrade T. Sawa was elected to the Diet in the recent general election. Several other Socialists polled a high vote. The party is growing marvelously.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

By Max S. Hayes.

From all reports from different parts of the country the Socialist party is making steady headway and will poll an increased vote in every State in the Union next month—in fact, there is little doubt but the gain will be fully a hundred per cent over the Presidential election in 1900. So far the comparatively unorganized States of Oregon, on the Pacific coast, and Maine, on the Atlantic coast, have more than doubled their vote, compared to two years ago. In the States in which more propaganda has been made the result will probably be surprising, especially in Pennsylvania, Colorado and other States both east and west. An evidence of growing strength is the increase of Socialist party papers, hardly a week going by that one or more do not start, while new speakers are mounting the "soap-box" every day. Another important sign is the pitiful attempt that is being made by the old-party politicians to dig up some "issue" to raise a noise and befuddle the minds of workingmen. The politicians hardly know whether the issue this year is the tariff, the gold ring, imperialism, three-cent fare, trusts or free coinage of wiener wurst. The Democracy is nearing another split between the conservative Cleveland-Hill-Gorman crowd and the Bryan-Johnson radicals, so-called, and Roosevelt's demands that the trusts be "restrained" has started a drawing of lines between the fossils and the strenuous reactionists in that party. Meanwhile the minority organizations are crumbling before the forward march of the young giant, the Socialist party. One hardly hears anything about the Prohibition party, the People's party is dead in all but Texas and a few other States, where a desperate effort is being made to keep up the appearance of being alive; the Union Reform party has formally disbanded and quit the field, and the crazy old deleonized Socialist Labor party is dragging its remaining foot in the political grave, about fifty of its remaining active workers having resigned or been suspended or expelled for "treason to the working class," and there is now nobody left but Mr. De Leon and a man named Corregan and a few obscure dues-payers. With the driftwood of reform and fanaticism out of the way, nothing on earth can prevent an enormous popular revolt against capitalism and its parties. Watch the returns next month.

National Organizer John C. Chase, of the Socialist party, writes enthusiastically of the growing sentiment in favor of Socialism among the farmers of Montana, Idaho, the Dakotas and other western States. Chase says the farmers are either workers, or their sons, who left the capitalistic-conquered industrial centers of the East, hoping to escape the modern slave-driver, but the villain still pursues them and they

are as deeply in the mud as we in the shops and factories are in the mire. Chase corroborates the views of A. M. Simons, who has made a special study of the agricultural conditions of this country, and points out that the clod-hopper is up against the same stone wall of economic facts that the wage-worker of the city is, viz.: labor-saving machinery and trustified capital. The People's party having been scuttled by Bryan and the "New" Democracy, which in turn has again gone into the control of the gold bugs, the farmers who are not capitalistic in instinct should line up with the Socialist party and aid Simons to circulate literature that will put their class on the right track. Get busy, Rube!

The colossal combinations that have been formed in the last four or five years are entering the final stage of capitalism's evolution rapidly enough. The press of the country, and especially New York, the fountain-head of great capitalism, is marveling at the acquired power of Morgan. "The whole world," says the daily press, "looks to an unpretentious office at No. 23 Wall street which bears the sign 'J. P. Morgan & Co.' for its cue whenever any transaction involving millions—whether it be a war or a coal strike, an amalgamation of steamship and railroad lines, or the financing of a bankrupt kingdom—is up for discussion." Our informants go on to say: "The total capital which J. P. Morgan & Co. controls and guards figures up NEARLY SIX BILLIONS AND A HALF OF DOLLARS, or, to be absolutely accurate, \$6,448,500,000. Besides this vast sum other great accumulations look small. The gold coin and gold certificates in the United States Treasury only amount to about \$750,000,000, and yet this is unprecedented. All the gold coined and uncoined in the whole world is estimated at \$4,841,000,000. The total number of human beings in the world is estimated at 1,320,000,000. The public debt of the United States on June 30, 1900, was \$1,107,711,257. The entire revenue of the forty-three principal nations of the world for the year 1900 was \$3,781,392,563. The properties in which J. P. Morgan & Co. are interested, either through control, through membership on their boards, through financing them, or by reason of acting as their fiscal agents, are, with their capitalization, as follows, according to lists furnished by the financial agencies: Ships, Atlantic Steamship Company, \$170,000,000; railroads of all kinds, seventeen, \$3,088,700,000; industrials, thirteen, \$2,022,250,000; banks and trust companies, seven, \$187,000,000; miscellaneous, sixty-seven, \$990,750,000." When it is considered that this tremendous revolution has taken place in the short space of five or six years—when one man controls by a billion more than all the capital invested in manufacturing—what will be the condition five years hence? Superficial thinkers sometimes declare in a pessimistic tone that "Socialism is all right, but it won't come in my time." Won't it? Well, maybe not, if all the old fogies sit still and allow one man to gain control of the nation and run it to suit himself—not only sit still, but actually assist him with their votes by throwing them away to the old parties, which are dominated by Morgan and his class. How do you like the outlook? Answer at the ballot-box next month.

During the past month a number of significant straws have blown across the economic field that are quite portentious. For weeks money

was "tight" in stock gambling circles. Bank statements were devoured greedily and heavy loans were negotiated. Money was brought to Wall street from Chicago and the extreme West, and ships were held up on the high seas and relieved of their treasure to relieve a "stringency" that had made itself manifest in the heart of capitalism. You see, it is this way: A Cabinet member in Washington explains to a correspondent of a Chicago daily that a blow at the trusts will hit the banks of New York, Chicago and the Western cities, and seriously injure the Western farmers. Therefore, says this Cabinet member, tariff revision will prove disastrous. He explains how this is by stating that the farmers have their money in their local banks; these country banks have their money in larger cities, like Omaha, Minneapolis, Kansas City, etc.; and that these banks have their reserves in the banks of Chicago. The banks of Chicago have their money in New York. So we have a string of banks, the smaller ones leaning on the larger for support. He continues: "In New York you will find that both deposits and loans have been enormous. The money is not in the banks. There are only six national banks in New York that have not been below their legal reserves since Jan. 1. You want to know where this money is? Well, \$450,000,000 is loaned by national banks on the bonds of industrial corporations. These corporations issued bonds instead of stocks because the national banks can take the former and can't the latter. Intrinsically they are not better than stocks. Here you see where \$450,000,000 of the country's surplus stands against a lot of undigested, promotion-produced securities. The trust companies have put out millions more in the same way. That is where we stand. It is all right so long as it is all right. But I don't want to see anything happen. I don't want to see these industrials begin to topple over, to fall against one another and come down in a heap like children's play-blocks. And this is one reason why I am opposed to a tariff revision agitation that might start things going the wrong way." Another Washington correspondent says the "tip" has gone out that "a financial and industrial panic is expected to be on about next March." What will that mean? Nothing much—except that those Western farmers can whistle for their money while they are holding the bag, many of the trusts will be "reorganized" into the hands of Morgan and Rockefeller and the small stockholders will be squeezed out like water from a sponge; the middle class capitalists will pour their little hoardings into a rat-hole and probably find the "red flag" of the Sheriff in front of their doors; and the labor class, well, the labor class that has always meddled in the fight between the great capitalists and the small ones, will suffer all the pangs of hunger and privation again, to which it is more or less accustomed. Natural causes are still at work, and, whether the next "squeeze" comes next March or a year later, it is coming. "Whom the gods would destroy they first make mad," and if American capitalism has not gone stark crazy, then the laws of evolution are out of joint. This is an opportune time to scatter Socialist party literature knee deep.

The general labor situation is satisfactory at present. All of the national unions are growing in membership and increasing their financial resources. While prices of necessities are advancing, the organized

workers are attempting, with considerable success, especially in the building, printing, clothing and several other industries, to "keep even," while, of course, the unorganized are not so well situated. There are no great strikes in progress except in the anthracite region. In West Virginia, thanks to the "mediation" of Governor White and his militia and deputies, the workers have been "conciliated" sufficiently to give up their struggle and return to the mines at the bosses' terms. In Pennsylvania, the corrupt Quay and his man, Governor Stone, have made every effort to drive the hard coal miners into their dark holes, but up to this writing they have been unsuccessful and will probably abandon the attempt. If the men can hold out until the A. F. of L. meets in New Orleans next month, it is quite likely that an assessment will be levied that will enable them to continue the struggle all winter. Enormous losses have been inflicted on the coal barons, but as they have millions behind them they pretend that they can stand it. Last year Morgan drove the iron and steel workers to the number of 50,000 back to work at the terms he dictated; this year he is attempting to subjugate 150,000 miners, and next year, it is rumored, he may test his strength against close to a million railway employes, as probably by that time he will have so arranged the big systems that he will be complete dictator. The crisis is drawing nearer each day, and the necessity of striking at the ballot-box is becoming plainer—so plain that even the most stupid can see it.

Another great combination is announced—not the kind in which a few millions or hundreds of millions are in the game, but billions are to be amalgamated. It is stated that the Vanderbilts and the Pennsylvania railway interests have reached an agreement, and that over 3,000 miles of railroad property, capitalized at \$2,200,000,000, will be amalgamated. The combine will cover nearly all the territory between the Mississippi and the Atlantic coast and the Potomac and Canadian border. In a short time, it is stated, Morgan and his crowd will be brought into the community and then there is no knowing what the combine will control. The meat is also about to join the procession of fat men with half a billion of capital, to control everything from ranches to retail stores in the cities, and to increase its capital gradually. The shibboleth: "Socialism in our time" was laughed at two years ago. There isn't quite so much hilarity at present. He who laughs last laughs best.

BOOK REVIEWS

Whitman's Ideal Democracy and Other Writings. Helena Bond, with a biography by the editor, Helen Tufts. Printed at the Everett Press, Boston, Mass., 123 pages, uncut, paper label, \$1.00.

This book will prove a welcome addition to the library of every admirer of Whitman. While other subjects than Whitman's writings are discussed in the various essays contained in the book, all such subjects are treated from the Whitman standpoint.

The essay whose title is given to the book is an exposition of Whitman's ideas as to a future society. This position, like that of the author herself, as set forth in the accompanying biography, is decidedly indefinite. In this it is very like Whitman himself. Nevertheless, the current of thought runs parallel with the philosophy of Socialism. After all, one does not really expect a poet to write political economy, and perhaps it would be well for Socialists if they could sometimes get a glimpse of the broad sweep of things which Whitman expresses. The book is bound in restful, artistic style, which makes it pleasant to hold and look upon.

Perfecting the Earth. C. W. Wooldridge. Utopia Publishing Company, Cleveland, Ohio. Cloth, 326 pages, \$1.50.

This book is but one of a class of books now grown to large numbers which have appeared within the last few years, and mostly within the last few months, which seem to indicate the approach of a new "Utopianism" totally different from the old, wholly imaginative sort. It would seem as if the Socialist movement had now reached a point where the imminence of a great social change is generally recognized, since these latter day Utopians write as of a society immediately at hand. They deal in mathematical calculations, locate their ideal societies in well-known existing places. They coldly calculate the amount of labor necessary to transform things as they are now into things as they would have them.

Dr. Wooldridge sets the beginning of his Utopia in the year 1913, when a great unemployed problem (another proof of Comrade Wilshire's prophetic ability) has come upon the country. A commanding general asks permission to transform his force from a military to an industrial army. This permission is granted in reckless disregard of the existence of any class struggle, and the army proceeds to transform large portions of the country into ideal communities. It is rather significant that the section selected by the author as most suitable for his ideal commonwealth is the arid land of the Southwest, since the

present facts would seem to point to these localities as the future fields of the greatest governmental activity the world has ever known.

The reader will find numerous interesting scientific speculations, and on the whole the book is one which cannot fail to suggest many new lines of thought. It would seem that the author is largely cut off, in thought at least, from the great stream of Socialist thought of to-day, as the work makes no account of the existing social forces which are working for Socialism, in this respect being much more like the older Utopias.

The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State. Frederick Engels. Translated from the German by Ernst Untermann. Charles H. Kerr & Company. Cloth, Standard Socialist Series, 217 pp. 50 cents.

One of the few Americans who has won a position among the thinkers in languages other than English is Lewis J. Morgan. His work on "Ancient Society" was the first basic analysis of the origins of many social institutions. This work has been persistently ignored and suppressed by the bourgeois scientists of this country. Now that it is practically out of print, there is double reason why this work by Frederick Engels, which was largely founded on that of Morgan, should be made accessible to English readers. It must not be thought, however, that Engels has simply summarized or popularized Morgan. He has done much more than this. He has added to Morgan's work the result of the researches of a large number of other writers in wholly different fields and has brought the work down to accord with almost the latest discoveries of modern anthropology and ethnology. The last revision of his work was made by Engels in June, 1891, and it is from this edition that the translation has been made.

This book has long been known as one of the great socialist classics and has been translated into almost every other language than English. It is in many senses a supplement to Marx's Capital in that it begins at the very origin of the things whose climax and latest developments are described in Capital. The first half of the book is given up to the discussion of the evolution of the human family. The continual changes in the marriage relation which have been brought about by changes in economic environment are set forth at length with a vast mass of evidence and information. It is shown how, prior to the coming of private property, the maternal law ruled in almost every division of the human race. The causes which gave rise to the modern family are analyzed and the following conclusion is arrived at as to possible future evolution:

"What we may anticipate about the adjustment of sexual relations after the impending downfall of capitalist production is mainly of a negative nature and mostly confined to elements that will disappear. But what will be added? That will be decided after a new generation has come to maturity: a race of men who never in their lives have had any occasion for buying with money or other economic means of power the surrender of a woman; a race of women who have never had any occasion for surrendering to any man for any other reason but love, or for refusing to surrender to their lover from fear of economic con-

sequences. Once such people are in the world, they will not give a moment's thought to what we to-day believe should be their course. They will follow their own practice and fashion their own public opinion about the individual practice of every person--only this and nothing more."

The remaining half of the book is given up to the discussion of the gradual evolution of the state. The first original forms of governmental organization as found in the "gens" is traced out among the Iroquois and the Greeks and its evolution into something approaching to the modern state in Athens. This same line of evolution is followed out among the Celts and Germans, showing the common character of evolution under the most diverse conditions, in many respects, but with the same economic environment. The final chapter on barbarism and civilization is a resume of the general steps in social evolution and the treatment of the origin of some institutions not discussed under the heads already mentioned. The book is really one of the two or three great socialist classics and now that it is in English it must find a place in the library of every one who hopes to master the real fundamental philosophy underlying socialism.

Trying to Cheat God. Marcus W. Robbins. Appeal to Reason Press. Paper, 60 pp. 15 cents.

The author compares this little bunch of essays to a chunk of "conglomerate" rock made up of "variously colored pebbles," and says the thoughts contained in them are not "original, neither are they startling, but merely what the average American picks up in his everyday reading." This is true, but the grouping and setting which he has given these "common thoughts" have made them very attractive reading and excellent propaganda for Socialism. The book consists of a series of essays not very closely connected, and largely based on what might be called historical texts. Some of the best of these are "The Builders of the Pyramids," a pithy, condensed history of human slavery; "The Robber Barons," discussing various forms of exploitation, and "The King Can Do No Wrong," a satire on the worship of authority. The essays abound in quaint and catchy phrases and telling hits. It is really something new and refreshing in the midst of a vast mass of commonplace material for Socialist propaganda.

Pages of Socialist History. W. Tcherkesoff. Published by C. B. Cooper, 114 Fifth ave., N. Y., 106 pp., 30 cents.

This is the sort of a book that would be written by a "DeLeonite" about a "Kangaroo." It has the same semblance of "evidence," the same reckless charges and personal invective that have so often disgraced Socialist controversies in the past. This purports to be a sort of expose of the sins and shortcomings of Social Democracy. It is really a re-hash of the charges and counter-charges that have been worn out years ago in all European countries but which come here with the appearance of fresh discoveries. The author does not seem to be aware of the fact that it would have no effect on the truth or falsity of Socialist premises if Marx, Engels, Liebknecht and Kautsky, against whom most of his venom is directed should all be

proven to be common thieves and degenerates, or any similar type of criminals. When he comes to discuss the doctrines of Socialism he becomes grotesque, re-hashes, without credit (although continuously charging plagiarism to everyone else) the long exploded statistics of Bernstein on concentration, repeats the stale and worn-out falsehoods about Socialists advocating state Socialism, and in general turns out a mess of stuff which will undoubtedly be accepted by those who are ignorant of the facts as valuable history.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

A Socialist Library for Five Dollars.

Every Socialist Local, and every isolated Socialist who is trying to make enough converts to start a Local, should have a circulating library of books explaining the fundamental principles of scientific Socialism. Five dollars of course is not enough to buy a complete library, but we are now making, for the first time, a special offer which will enable our readers to have a better Socialist library than was ever offered before for the same amount of money. The books included in it are as follows:

The International Socialist Review, vol. I.....	\$2.00
The International Socialist Review, vol. II.....	2.00
Love's Coming-of-Age, Edward Carpenter.....	1.00
Britain for the British, Robert Blatchford.....	.50
Karl Marx, Memoirs by Wilhelm Liebknecht50
Collectivism, Emile Vandervelde50
The American Farmer, A. M. Simons.....	.50
The Last Days of the Ruskin Co-Operative Association.....	.50
The Origin of the Family, Frederick Engels.....	.50
Socialism, Utopian and Scientific, Frederick Engels.....	.30

The books amount at retail prices to \$8.30. For \$5.00 we will send them, expressage prepaid, to any address in the United States. To any stockholder in our co-operative company we will send the same set, repaid, for \$4.00. This offer also applies to any one who now becomes a stockholder either by paying \$10.00 cash, or by paying \$1.00 down and agreeing to remit \$1.00 a month for nine months. Only 150 of these libraries are for sale since the number of bound volumes of the International Socialist Review is limited and no more can be had when the present supply is exhausted.

Crime and Criminals.

This new book, by Clarence S. Darrow, cannot be better described than by reproducing in full the characteristic preface written for it by the author as follows:

"This address is a stenographic report of a talk made to the prisoners in the Chicago jail. Some of my good friends have insisted that while my theories are true, I should not have given them to the inmates of a jail.

"Realizing the force of the suggestion that the truth should not

be spoken to all people, I have caused these remarks to be printed on rather good paper, and in a somewhat expensive form. In this way the truth does not become cheap and vulgar, and is only placed before those whose intelligence and affluence will prevent their being influenced by it."

The address is written in Mr. Darrow's best style and contains a great deal of truth not usually spoken in polite society. It is handsomely printed and bound and will be mailed to any address for 10 cents.

The Social Science Series.

This series, published by Swan Sonnenschein & Co., of London, contains a number of works which are of great value to every student of socialism. These books have hitherto been supplied to American readers through a New York importing house. The retail price has been fixed at \$1.00 for single numbers and \$1.25 for double numbers, and we have been unable to offer them to our stockholders at a discount for the reason that we could buy them only at a margin which barely covered the cost of handling. We have now, however, made arrangement to import these books direct, and we shall be able to supply them to our stockholders at 40 per cent discount by mail or 50 per cent discount by express. The books which will be included in our first importation are as follows:

SINGLE NUMBERS.

Work and Wages. J. E. Thorold Rogers.
Civilization: Its Cause and Cure. Edward Carpenter.
Quintessence of Socialism. Dr. Schaffle.
Religion of Socialism. E. Belfort Bax.
Ethics of Socialism. E. Belfort Bax.
England's Ideal, etc. Edward Carpenter.
Bismarck and State Socialism. W. H. Dawson.
Story of the French Revolution. E. B. Bax.
Evolution of Property. Paul Lafargue.
German Socialism and F. Lassalle. W. H. Dawson.
Outlooks from the New Standpoint. E. Belfort Bax.
The Student's Marx. Edward Aveling, D. Sc.
Ferdinand Lassalle. E. Bernstein.
Parasitism: Organic and Social. Massart and Vandervelde.
Revolution and Counter Revolution. Karl Marx.
Over-Production and Crises. Karl Rodbertus.
Village Communities in India. B. H. Baden Powell, M. A., C. I. E.

DOUBLE NUMBERS.

Conditions of the Working Class in England in 1844. F. Engels.
Socialism: Its Growth and Outcome. W. Morris and E. B. Bax.
The Economic Foundations of Society. Achille Loria.
These twenty books amount to \$20.75 at retail prices. We propose to import at once fifty sets of them for the benefit of our stockholders. The net price per set to our stockholders after the books arrive will

be \$10.38, purchaser to pay expressage. To any stockholder however, who will remit \$8.50 before October 31, we will send a set of the twenty books by express as soon as received from London. They should arrive the first week of December.

This offer is open to any one subscribing for stock during October, as well as to our present stockholders.

Our co-operative company will before long be in a position to furnish its stockholders with every Socialist book worth reading at a substantial discount from advertised prices. We do not however offer a discount on books not included in our list, for the reason that when we have to buy in small lots from other publishers, the discount we get does not pay the cost of handling.

Socialist Literature for Striking Coal Miners.

The last three issues of the International Socialist Review explain our plan for sending Socialist literature for distribution among the striking miners in the anthracite coal fields. The reports thus far received indicate that our literature is being used in Pennsylvania with excellent effect, and that the comrades there are taking advantage of the occasion to make new converts to Socialism at a most encouraging rate. All money received is used to send Socialist literature figured at our lowest stockholders' prices to comrades in the coal region who are vouched by the secretary of the Socialist party of Pennsylvania. Contributions thus far received are as follows:

Previously acknowledged	\$21.20
Joseph Bing, New York City.....	.45
John J. McLean, Washington, D. C.....	.50
I. E., Chicago	3.00
Chas. James Fox, New York City.....	10.00
"A Friend," Chicago	10.00
Charles H. Kerr & Company.....	10.00
<hr/>	
Total	\$55.15

Our Socialist Co-operative Publishing House.

On pages 189 and 190 of last month's Review we announced a new departure in our co-operative plan, by which any Socialist may become a joint owner in our co-operative publishing house by paying one dollar a month for ten months, with the privilege of buying books at stockholders' prices as soon as the first payment is made. This offer has met with a prompt response from the Socialists of America. Thirty-five new stock subscriptions have been received during the month of September, bringing the number of our stockholders up to 460. The maximum number allowed under our present charter is 1,000, but we shall soon make application to the Secretary of State for an amended charter which will admit our enrolling 2,500. The publishing business carried on by our company is paying expenses and

the money received from the sale of stock is not used to make up deficits, but to pay the first cost of publishing new books. The faster new capital is subscribed, the more Socialist books we can publish.

"The Land of the Noonday Night."

This song, by Ernest Crosby, which was first published in the September number of the International Socialist Review, has been set to music by Eleanor Smith, one of the most successful composers in Chicago and is now published in sheet music form by Charles H. Kerr & Company. The music store price is 30 cents, but a copy will be mailed to any reader of the Review for 10 cents.

The Principles of Social Progress.

This work is by James Bale Morman, A. B. To quote from a review by William Thurston Brown, "It is one of the few essentially scientific treatments of the Social problem, and it is doubtful if an equally broad survey of history and biology in their relation to Social evolution can be found anywhere in print within the scope of 240 pages." The book is bound in cloth, and is equal in appearance to books usually sold at \$1.00. The price, however, is 50 cents postpaid, and we have lately made a new arrangement with the author by which we can offer it to our stockholders at 30 cents postpaid.

What to Read on Socialism.

This is the title of a 32 page booklet with red cover, uniform in size and style with the Pocket Library of Socialism, and into the preparation of which we have put an immense amount of labor. It explains first, the reasons why every intelligent reader should make a study of Socialism. Then comes a brief outline of the work done by the International Socialist Review, with the complete table of contents of the 27 numbers issued* from the beginning up to and including the issue for September, 1902. This is followed by a descriptive paragraph on each of the Socialist books published by this house. These paragraphs are not written to show how admirable each book is (they are all admirable in our opinion, otherwise we shouldn't have published them); they are written as a guide to the reader which will enable him to judge which book gives the precise information he may be looking for. The last portion of the book describes the plan of organization of the Socialist Co-Operative Publishing House of Charles H. Kerr & Company, and the benefits both to the individual and the Socialist movement from subscribing for stock. A copy of this booklet will be mailed to any one requesting it. Packages for distribution will be supplied at much less than cost. We should offer them free but for the fact that in that case more copies would be asked for than could be distributed to good advantage. We will mail twenty copies for 10 cents or 100 for 50 cents, and will send

any number by express at purchaser's expense for 25 cents a hundred. If you can get a man to read Socialist literature he is bound to be a Socialist soon, and this booklet is the best thing we have yet been able to devise for inducing people to begin reading books on Socialism.

Announcement.

Just as we go to press, arrangements have been completed by which we become the publishers of "Socialism and the Social Movement of the Nineteenth Century," by Werner Sombart. This book has been recognized ever since its publication as one of the very best expositions of Socialism in existence, although written by one who does not wholly accept the Socialist position. It has been published hitherto by Putnam's Sons at \$1.25. We shall issue it in identically the same style, but will be able to furnish it to our stockholders at 60 cents, postpaid, and to others at one dollar. Order at once, as our first edition is not large and is apt to be exhausted shortly.

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY,
56 Fifth ave., Chicago.

A SOCIALIST CLASSIC



THE ORIGIN OF THE FAMILY, Private Property and the State

By FREDERICK ENGELS.

Translated by Ernst Untermann.

There are a few books the reading of which constitutes a necessary foundation to an understanding of Socialism. One of these is Engels' "Origin of the Family." Hitherto this has not been accessible in English, although it has long been translated into almost every other European language.

It deals with fundamentals and traces the growth of those social institutions which are to the student of society what elements are to the chemist. Yet it is written in plain language easily understandable without the knowledge of any technical vocabulary.

It starts with the beginnings of human life and traces the institution of the family, of private property and the state from their first rude origins to their present forms, showing the great changes that have taken place in response to economic transformations.

As a study in Socialist philosophy of institutions, as a storehouse of information on fundamental points, there is no book of anything near the same size that can begin to rival it.

CLOTH, 218 PAGES, 50 CENTS POSTPAID.

Charles H. Kerr & Company, Publishers,
56 Fifth Avenue, Chicago.